

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 20, 1989

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Open our hearts, O God, to the opportunities for service that are all about us. Teach us that in every situation where people gather, there is time when we can witness to justice and mercy, where compassion can be given, and where life and love can be exalted. As Your presence, gracious God, is in every place, so may Your spirit never depart from us, but continue to guide, guard, and keep us all our days. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. McNULTY] please lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. McNULTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## A STUDY OF SIGNIFICANT PLACES IN LABOR HISTORY

(Mr. McNULTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would authorize a study of nationally significant places in American labor history.

I would like to thank Chairman BRUCE VENTO for his original cosponsorship of this legislation, because it is important to remind future generations of the role labor has played in the development of our great Nation.

I believe we have a need—indeed a responsibility—to examine labor's history in depth. It was labor that built our houses, roadways, ships, and trains; and labor provided the technologies that have defended our Nation in time of peril.

The city of Troy, NY, which is in my district, has been called the "birthplace" of the American labor movement, and that great city played a formative role in the industrial revolu-

tion. In fact, the Hudson-Mohawk Rivers park region of New York has preserved many of the original homes of workers as evidence of the early days of unionism.

I hope my colleagues will join me and Chairman VENTO to recognize our labor history and the men and women who made it such a significant part of our national heritage.

## THE DRUG WAR NEEDS A REAL COMMANDER

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, America is going to lose the war on drugs unless we create a unified command to fight it.

Although Congress is providing hundreds of millions of dollars for the effort, it is clear after studying this issue for the past 18 months in the Intelligence Committee, that our various Federal agencies are all going off in their own well-meaning directions.

Our law enforcement agencies naturally see it as an immediate problem: kick down the door and make an arrest. Our intelligence agencies see it as a strategic problem: collect information on the structure and money flows of the international narcotics trade, but be very reluctant to share that information with law enforcement agencies because they might compromise sources and methods. The Defense Department is uncomfortable about getting involved because counternarcotics is not their normal mission. The State Department worries about stepping on diplomatic toes.

We are going to end up throwing billions at this problem, only to see the various agencies scrambling for their piece of the pie without being responsive to unified direction.

Unless drug czar Bill Bennett, an outstanding individual, or someone else, is given clear cut authority to run the show, our war on drugs is going to be a costly failure.

## CONGRESS SHOULD INVESTIGATE REVELATORY STATEMENTS OF WILLIAM F. WELD

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Washington is like a one-eyed jack in

the deck of playing cards. No one ever sees the hidden side, until today.

William F. Weld, the Republican candidate for Governor of Massachusetts, has admitted a stark truth. He said that Reagan officials often pressed him to stop investigation of Reagan friends and allies.

Now, if my colleagues will recall, Weld is the prosecutor who resigned because of the sleaze in the Department of Justice run by Ed Meese, but he also said another outstanding thing yesterday. He said that he, quote, unquote, once obeyed a written order to begin "a criminal investigation of a Reagan critic."

Now, what is going on here? Let us tell it like it is.

I say to my colleagues, "If you know the right people, you're O.K.; and, if you don't, and someone dislikes you politically in America, they target you, and come after you and screw you."

Mr. Speaker, is that the way it works?

I am saying today that that is not the way it should be, and, as the No. 1 critic of Ronald Reagan, I have been investigated every year for the last 7 years. I do not like it. I am saying, "Get off my back, and start meting out justice for all, like it should be, not just justice for the in people."

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Congress should investigate the revelatory statements of William Weld. Thank God he has come forward.

## THROUGH THE DRUG WAR MAZE IN 28 DAYS—DAY 3: HOUSE BANKING COMMITTEE

(Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to continue highlighting the maze of congressional panels that the President's drug czar must pass through to come up with a national drug-control strategy—the so-called war on drugs.

Today, I call to your attention the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, as it relates to the war on drugs. Banking and Finance and four of its subcommittees have some jurisdiction over the Nation's drug-control efforts and the work of the President's drug czar. For example, the processing of money derived from illicit drug activities and drug law enforcement in public hous-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ing projects are two areas under this panel's jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, these areas ought to be handled by a single oversight committee that would coordinate all drug-control legislation. It just does not make sense to spread this authority among more than 80 committees, subcommittees and select committees. Such a fragmented setup is better suited for its PR value than for an ability to get anything done.

But that is all the war on drugs is right now—a public relations campaign. And that is all it will ever be as long as the Congress runs its efforts by choir rather than by troop.

I call on my colleagues to support legislative efforts, currently under way in the House and the Senate, to consolidate jurisdiction over drug-control policy. We must have a coordinated effort, and the lines of authority must be clearly drawn, if we are to have an effective drug-control strategy and a true war on drugs.

#### SUPPORT CHINESE STUDENTS

(Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with respect, admiration, and heartfelt support for the students at the University of Rochester and all across this Nation who are assembling today in endorsement of the nationwide American Students' Resolution in Support of the Chinese Student Struggle for Freedom and Democracy.

Chinese and Chinese-American students in the United States have been an indispensable link in helping students in China to keep abreast of what has really been happening in their own country. Through a deluge of facsimile transmissions of Western news accounts to China, these students truly have been the lines of communication in this fight for democracy.

Today, students at the University of Rochester and elsewhere in this Nation are holding press conferences to demonstrate their solidarity with and support for the Chinese student movement for democracy. They recognize the courage of the Chinese students who have to endure repression and adversity unimaginable to most of us.

I applaud the efforts of the students at the University of Rochester and all the other colleges and universities who are participating in this demonstration of support for the Chinese students in America and in China. Their endeavor preserves the memory of those who died in the horror and tragedy at Tiananmen Square.

#### HELPING AMERICA'S WORKING POOR BY MAKING EITC REFORM A REALITY

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI of the Ways and Means Committee announced additional proposals for the reconciliation bill.

Included was an expansion of the earned income tax credit much along the lines I have been advocating for 2 years now.

I want to congratulate Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI for coming out in favor of EITC expansion and Representative DOWNEY and others on the committee for their work on this important reform.

There might be differences between my Family Living Wage Act and the chairman's proposal, but still, Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI has made a very positive move that will help us to do something significant for America's working poor who have children to support.

I note that the chairman has proposed to vary the earned income tax credit for family size, adjusting the EITC for up to three children.

Further, I note that Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI's proposal includes an extra amount where the child care need is greatest—for families with preschool children.

The cost of his proposal does press the outer limits of what some people are prepared to accept. But if this is our major initiative to help working poor families, it should be cost-effective.

I look forward to joining Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI to help America's working poor by making EITC reform a reality.

#### INTRODUCTION OF POPULATION CENTERS BILL

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Webster decision rolling back Roe versus Wade the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] and I today are rolling out what we think is a very, very important bill, and that is to reclaim the very important leadership role that the United States of America used to have in family planning pre-Ronald Reagan and used to have in science and technology.

□ 1010

We are offering a population centers bill in which we ask the NIH to form five different research centers in America, three dealing with safe contraceptives and two dealing with infertility research.

Almost every other industrialized country has moved way ahead of us. We think it is really tragic that many people in the United States now are using exactly the same form of family planning that Cleopatra did, a sponge, because they have no other form that they think is trustworthy.

We think it is unbelievable that the Reagan administration has done so much damage to that center. People should have choices. They should have choices about their families. They should have choices in child care later on, they should have choices about parental leave. They should have all sorts of choices that have been denied by this administration.

So we will be rolling out this bill today and we hope that many, many people join us, and that we can get this country back on a course of giving family choices once again to the people who need them.

#### TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to mark an anniversary—a 15th anniversary. While most anniversaries are happy occasions, however, this one is, unfortunately, a very sad one.

Mr. Speaker, July 20, 1974, was the day that Turkish troops undertook the invasion of Cyprus that resulted in the occupation and colonization of 40 percent of the previous independent Republic's territory. Today, 15 years after the invasion, thousands of Turkish troops and scores of thousands of settlers from Turkey are illegally occupying and exploiting the properties of 200,000 displaced Greek-Cypriots who have become refugees in the land of their birth.

Rather than conciliatory steps, Mr. Speaker, Turkey and the Turkish-Cypriot leadership, in direct violation of relevant U.N. resolutions and international law, have taken a series of actions, subsequent to the 1974 invasion, which are aimed at consolidating the occupation and division of the small Mediterranean Republic. As recently as 1983, there was even an illegal attempt to create a new Turkish political entity in the occupied areas. An entity, I might add, that only one country—Turkey—has recognized as legal.

Mr. Speaker, we, in Congress, have a responsibility to use our influence to help create a unified Cyprus. Turkey is, after all, largely financing her military actions in Cyprus from United States foreign aid moneys. My colleague, HELEN BENTLEY, has introduced a bill which I am proudly an original cosponsor of, H.R. 1045, which

seeks to condition United States assistance to Turkey on steps taken toward reaching a solution to the Cypriot problem. I encourage all our colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 1045 and help restore peace and unity to Cyprus.

#### SPACE EXPLORATION GIVES US VALUABLE TECHNOLOGY

(Mr. POSHARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago tonight, in my living room at my home in Marion, IL, I watched *Apollo 11* land on the Moon. I stayed up early into the morning, rocking my son to sleep, holding the future of my life in my arms, watching the future of my country unfold before my eyes.

Some in a generation before found it hard to believe we had actually landed on the Moon. Those in a generation later, such as my son Dennis and daughter Kris, cannot imagine life if we had not.

I will never forget the unbelievable courage of American heroes Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins.

Space exploration has given us technology that improves our daily lives, an understanding of the world around us, and a belief that America can achieve whatever it sets its mind to.

Within our budget we should continue to pursue the standards set by *Apollo 11*. Manned and unmanned space exploration is a necessary part of our scientific and strategic future.

Let us resolve to continue to push back the boundaries of our ability to dream and our determination to do great things.

#### THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF ILLEGAL OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS BY TURKISH ARMY

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to recognize the 15th anniversary of the illegal occupation of the island Republic of Cyprus by the Turkish Army. After 15 years the Turkish Army still occupies 40 percent of the island, forcing hundreds of thousands of Cypriots to live as refugees in their own land.

This occupation, declared illegal by both the United States and the United Nations, is being continued in part with American tax dollars, \$500 million of which go to Turkey every year, much of it in the form of military aid.

I renew my request to all my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1045, the Bentley-Bilirakis-Feighan bill, to halt aid to Turkey until

that country takes steps to end the illegal occupation of Cyprus.

This Congress has gone to great lengths to recognize and deplore human rights violations in numerous countries which receive no U.S. foreign aid. Let us focus our attention on a villainous depravation of human rights being perpetrated by the nation which receives the third largest package of United States foreign aid, Turkey.

#### DEFICIT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, no one is happy about this year's budget result. Everyone involved in the process—the White House, Republican and Democratic Members of Congress—say “much more must be done” and then immediately disagree over what.

Today I am introducing legislation that not only meets this challenge, but also begins making vital investments in our country's future by creating a trust fund called the deficit reduction account—or DRA. If new taxes are passed, they can be allocated to the DRA where they will be used only to reduce the deficit—not for new spending. But the DRA does not stop here. After 5 years have passed, the accumulated principal and interest stays in the fund. But new interest earned after the fifth year will be allocated to vital capital-intensive programs that need assured long-term funding. Building infrastructure like highway construction, the space program, scientific investments—those programs that truly build America.

With the DRA, the American people get a double bang for their buck. First, there is no new spending, but true deficit reduction. Second, this provides genuine investment making our country stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring the deficit reduction account.

#### REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS ORGANIZED FOR 101ST CONGRESS

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Republican Task Force on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been organized for the 101st Congress. I served as the chairman of the task force in the 100th Congress and it is with great pleasure that I assume the chairmanship again in the 101st Congress.

The Republican Task Force on Indian Affairs was first organized in 1979 when the Interior Committee began considering Indian issues at the full committee without a subcommittee. Its purpose is to coordinate Indian policy and legislative issues for the Republican members of the committee, and its chairman acts as floor manager of bills under consideration by the House.

Serving with me as members of the task force for the 101st Congress are the Honorable DON YOUNG, of Alaska, the Honorable ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, of California, the Honorable LARRY CRAIG, of Idaho, the Honorable JAMES V. HANSEN, of Utah, the Honorable BARBARA VUCANOVICH, of Nevada, the Honorable BEN BLAZ, of Guam, the Honorable ELTON GALLEGLY, of California, the Honorable STAN PARRIS, of Virginia, the Honorable ROBERT F. SMITH, of Oregon, the Honorable JIM LIGHTFOOT, of Iowa, and the Honorable CRAIG THOMAS, of Wyoming.

The committee expects to have a wide range of Indian issues before it during this Congress. Through the forum provided by the task force, we will be better able to reach consensus on key issues relating to Indian affairs legislation. In this way, we can enact laws that have a sound legal and policy basis, and that better serve the needs of Indian and non-Indian people alike.

#### TIME TO REDEDICATE OURSELVES TO THE CIVILIAN SPACE PROGRAM

(Ms. OAKAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, it seems hardly possible that in the 1960's President Kennedy issued a clarion call to land a man on the Moon, and here we are today celebrating the 20th anniversary.

I am proud to be from the State of Ohio where we have contributed the astronauts, the late great Judy Resnick, JOHN GLENN, Neil Armstrong, and countless civil servants who work at places like the Lewis Research Center.

The value of civilian space research, the spinoffs affect every aspect of American life from cataract surgery, the medicine we use, the clothes we wear and the food we eat.

The world has looked to our country for leadership. It is time to rekindle that leadership, our sense as Americans for adventure and creativity, and rededicate ourselves to the civilian space program.

# A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE SPACE PROGRAM AND THE STEALTH BOMBER

(Mr. DAVIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, today, on the 20th anniversary of the Apollo landing, is an appropriate time to note the striking similarities between our space program and the Stealth bomber. I think there is an important analogy to be made.

Remember what the critics said when we began the space program years ago.

The critics said it was too expensive.

The critics said there were too many other priorities.

The critics said the technology was too revolutionary.

The critics said it was unnecessary.

Well the critics were wrong, and the critics who say we do not need a Stealth bomber are wrong too.

The Stealth is versatile. It can be used in nearly any conflict scenario \* \* \*. It is stabilizing. The bomber portion of our triad has always been the best in that regard \* \* \*. It is revolutionary. It will change the way we build aircraft long into the future and it will render obsolete a Soviet air defense system worth more than \$300 billion \* \* \*. It is the future. It is a great opportunity that we should not let slip between our fingers.

□ 1020

## ENFORCEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. HAYES of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. One of the alleged primary goals of American foreign policy since 1945 has been to contain the influence of communism, or any other institution that has proven to be the major contributor to the detriment of a race or to a nation of people. Unfortunately, this philosophy has been applicable over the years to the black race, either through inadvertent omission or deliberate exclusion.

This is an issue that is of deep concern not only to me as a Congressman but to my constituents and to African Americans throughout this country who believe that democracy should not be selective in the application of it, but that we should apply it on an even basis.

Our recent actions supporting efforts to tighten sanctions against Communist China are to be applauded. China's bloody repression of those seeking democracy in a seemingly changeless society, reminds me of an-

other equally intolerable situation, repression in South Africa.

I have to ask how many more lives have to be exterminated in South Africa before administrative sanctions are enforced? How many Steven Biko's, Nelson Mandela's, and Alan Boesak's must endure South African tyranny before an administrative stand is taken? Finally, how much longer does the institution of apartheid have to exist before it is recognized by the Bush administration as the sole contributor to the detriment of the black race and to the nation of South Africa?

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Bush administration to recognize their apathy in regards to their policy initiatives toward South Africa, and to be consistent with our foreign policy objectives. Let us tighten the noose on South Africa.

In light of press speculation that an unprecedented meeting of the leader of the apartheid regime, F.W. de Klerk, and President George Bush is imminent, I, as an elected official with the interests of mankind at heart, again urge President Bush not to meet with Mr. de Klerk. Administrative refusal to meet with a leader that advocates white supremacy and minority inferiority will clearly indicate to the South African Government that the institution of apartheid must be abandoned.

## THE GOAL OF ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, the United States must begin to develop and implement policies that move us toward the goal of energy independence.

This morning the U.S. Senate took an important step in that direction by passing Senate bill 83, the uranium enrichment bill, by a margin of 73 to 26.

We in the House of Representatives must also pass this important and needed legislation, already introduced in the House, which will allow the United States to maintain a competitive, financially strong and secure uranium enrichment capability by establishing a Government-owned corporation to operate the Nation's uranium enrichment enterprise.

We can be proud that uranium enrichment technology was developed in the United States. It was only 15 years ago that the United States controlled 100 percent of the world's market for uranium enrichment services.

Today, however, the U.S. uranium enrichment services, which are produced and sold by the U.S. Government through the Department of

Energy, receives less than half of the world's uranium enrichment business.

As Congressman for a huge Department of Energy uranium enrichment plant in Paducah, KY, which employs about 1,300 people, I want to emphasize that under the current structure the United States will continue to lose its already decreasing market share of the enrichment business. The current structure is not cost effective. Passage of the uranium enrichment bill introduced in the House will create a new corporation to replace the current structure. The new corporation will have the commercial flexibility that typical Government agencies lack, possessing the ability to respond quickly to market needs through contracting and pricing without the bureaucratic restrictions of the current structure.

Now is clearly the time for the House to take note and act accordingly, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

## SPACE, THE FINAL FRONTIER

(Mr. LOWERY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 20th anniversary of humankind's first landing on the Moon. As our Nation celebrates one of its greatest accomplishments let us not just remember but look to the future with dreams of new destinations.

Mr. Speaker, some of our young people today grew up watching "Star Trek" or reruns of "Star Trek," but many of us grew up watching the space program grow up. The astronauts of the Apollo 11 mission were our heroes. There was the thrill of the unknown, the daring of the astronauts, the successes for our country as we competed with the Russians and won. Neil Armstrong walked on the Moon, and we stared at the television set in disbelief and unquenchable pride.

Each launch, each mission, each walk in space added to a storehouse of information. And as NASA devoured reams of information, it hungered for more. Like Socrates we have become so aware of and overwhelmed by the mysteries of space that we can say as he did, "I know nothing except the fact of my ignorance."

Today let us commit our Nation to the spirit of those space pioneers and turn ignorance into an educational commitment to our future in space. I hope the construction of the space station will be the jumping off place to worlds unknown and unexplored.

**WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2916, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1990**

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 205 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 205**

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2916) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes, all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 4, lines 16 through 20; beginning on page 6, line 20 through page 7, line 8; beginning on page 7, line 13 through page 9, line 4; beginning on page 10, lines 14 through 21; beginning on page 12, line 18 through page 17, line 7; line 16 through page 19, line 13; beginning on page 20, lines 1 through 20; beginning on page 22, line 1 through page 26, line 25; beginning on page 27, line 8 through page 28, line 18; beginning on page 30, lines 5 through 15; beginning on page 31, line 6 through page 32, line 4; beginning on page 32, line 12 through page 33, line 15; beginning on page 33, line 21 through page 34, line 20; beginning on page 35, line 3 through page 38, line 13; beginning on page 40, lines 1 through 14; beginning on page 40, line 19 through page 41, line 24; beginning on page 43, line 6 through page 49, line 2; beginning on page 49, lines 12 through 16; beginning on page 51, line 1 through page 52, line 9; and beginning on page 53, line 1 through "States:" on line 22. In any case where this resolution waives points of order against only a portion of a paragraph, a point of order against any other provision in such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. It shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative SCHUMER of New York, or his designee. Said amendments may be considered en bloc and may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto. Said amendments shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 205 waives points of order and makes in order en bloc amendments in the consideration of H.R. 2916, the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1990. This rule does not provide for the bill's consideration since general appropriation bills are privileged under rules of the House. The rule also does not contain any provisions relating to time for general debate. Customarily, general debate will be limited by a unanimous-consent request by the floor manager when the bill is considered.

House Resolution 205 waives clause 2 of rule XXI against specified provisions of the bill. This clause would prohibit unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in general appropriations bills and would restrict the offering of amendments proposing limitations not specifically contained or authorized in existing law.

This resolution further provides that in any instance where this resolution waives points of order against only a portion of a paragraph, a point of order against any other provision in such paragraph may be made only against such provision, and not against the entire paragraph.

The provisions for which these waivers are provided are detailed by reference to page and line in H.R. 2916. Generally, these waivers have been granted for specified provisions in titles I, II, and III of the bill.

House Resolution 205 also makes in order the amendments printed in Report No. 101-152 accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative SCHUMER of New York or his designee. The resolution provides that these amendments may be considered en bloc and may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, with the time to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a member opposed thereto. Said amendments shall not be subject for a demand for division on the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2916 appropriates \$65 billion for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and for 18 independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices. The bill provides \$29.5 billion in new budget authority for the Department of Veterans Affairs, with a substantial portion of this money directed to veterans' medical care. I know that most of my colleagues recognize the value of this funding in ensuring that veterans will have access to a dependable medical care system.

H.R. 2916 also provides \$15.2 billion in new budget authority for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including a sizeable amount allocated for subsidized housing; and \$12.3 billion in new budget authority for NASA, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses several important programs. I urge adoption of the rule and of the underlying bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, in the Rules Committee meeting on this rule the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. ROE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] joined in a bipartisan request to the Rules Committee. All they wanted was for the rule to provide for en bloc consideration of their amendment, and to protect it from a division of the question.

The amendment was a very modest proposal. They simply sought to shift a total of \$100 million among programs within the jurisdiction of their committee. They were not proposing to change funding within the jurisdiction of any other authorization committee.

Believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, the majority on the Rules Committee turned down this very reasonable request by a record vote of 5 to 6.

And not only did they turn down this request, but at the same time they provided for the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] exactly the same protections which had been sought by the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. The Rules Committee majority even gave more to the gentleman from New York. Because his amendment is protected from further amendments. The Schumer amendment would take money away from the jurisdiction of one authorizing committee and give it to programs within the jurisdiction of different authorizing committees.

I have no objection at all to the gentleman from New York having his amendment considered en bloc. But I do think that it is unfair for the chairman and ranking Republican member of a full committee to be denied a similar request.

Mr. Speaker, this appropriation bill provides for some very important programs.

The new Department of Veterans Affairs will receive its funding under this bill. As my colleagues may recall. We ran into problems earlier this year because veterans medical care was not fully funded in the current fiscal year.

In the Rules Committee we were assured that this bill provides adequate

funds for veterans medical care for the next fiscal year. We certainly do not want to see a repeat of the situation we had earlier this year. Where funding for veterans health care programs was held hostage in an attempt to hook on other less necessary programs.

The veterans of this country answered the call when the Nation was in need, and we should never again permit anyone to play political games with the funds needed for their health care.

Mr. Speaker, the refusal of the Rules Committee to provide for the Roe-Walker amendment can be corrected. The House can defeat the motion for the previous question on this rule. If that is done, I will then be prepared to offer an amendment to the rule to provide for the consideration of the Roe-Walker amendment en bloc. The amendment would also include a waiver of clause 2, rule XXI. This is the only way I see to provide fair and equitable treatment to the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

I urge this body, the Members of this House, to vote down the previous question so that we can be fair to all of the committee chairmen of this House. It simply is not fair to allow special treatment to be given to one Member and not allow it to be given to another who is more senior and a full committee chairman as well.

So I urge Members of this House to vote down the previous question so that we can get down to business and vote on the HUD and independent agencies appropriation. We can correct the shortcomings of this rule by giving the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] what they requested.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a no vote on the previous question.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today the rule on the Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Appropriation Act.

I first wish to commend the committee and the subcommittee on this bill. I have some reservations about it as to certain points, but I think generally overall, within their 302 allotment, the committee has done an outstanding job, especially in the areas of the Veterans' Administration and in the housing parts of the bill. As one who has a veterans hospital in my district and who recognizes the need that we have to upgrade those medical facilities and the medical care for our veterans, I am very pleased at what we did in the supplemental appropriation earlier passed

this summer, and what we have now done in this bill to bring about the required medical care for our veterans who have served this country so well in times past in order to preserve those freedoms that we all enjoy and the comforts of this country rather than to have to live in a style of elsewhere. I wish to commend the committee for doing that.

My serious question is on what the committee has done in regard to the NASA budget, in regard to our space activities and the allocation of funds there, as other members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology have those reservations as well. I would much rather have seen some different allocation of those funds.

□ 1040

It does not mean necessarily that if those are not corrected that I will support the bill. No, I plan to support the bill and vote for final passage, even though we may not be able to do the things in the NASA budget as I would like to have seen them done and even though we may not even have that opportunity.

I hope we will be able to work this out so at least we will have the opportunity to let the House decide on whether or not we should have more funds in the space station. Let the House decide whether or not we should have more funds for our space plane or whether we should almost mothball that opportunity.

Let the House decide whether or not there should be funding for—additional funding—for the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in California which NASA did not ask for, no one else really asked for, but all of a sudden we find it in the appropriation bill.

It is those reservations I have, but generally I feel that the bill overall is a good bill and we will be having other amendments during the period today, most of which, after the question of NASA matters, will be taken up concerning the Housing and Urban Development, most of, if not all of the other amendments.

Some of those amendments I think are very worthwhile. Others I think I have some concerns about.

I will wait to hear the chairman of the subcommittee as to whether or not he feels that those amendments should be adopted by the House, because he and the authorizing committee are probably more familiar with those programs than most Members of this House.

So we would welcome the gentleman from Michigan's viewpoint on those.

I would like to address one other amendment that will be offered that I think needs to bear some attention and I am sure will be thoroughly discussed when we get into the Committee of the Whole.

That is the amendment of the gentleman from New York, commonly known as the Schumer amendment.

As you know, this amendment was offered last year and was overwhelmingly defeated. This amendment, if it would be adopted, would basically do away with our total effort for a space station. It would, in other words, put our whole space effort, the future of this country in space, in mothballs.

At the same time, when we today, on the 20th anniversary of man's landing on the moon, are celebrating that past effort which was so successful; many of us remember the words of our astronaut, Neil Armstrong, when he first set foot on the moon and talked about one small step for man and a giant step for mankind.

For us today then to say that we are going to stop our efforts in space and not continue those efforts that lead to a greater future of this country, I think would be a wrong decision.

I know that the gentleman from New York would allocate those funds for very useful purposes. I will not deny that. I will not deny that we could use additional money for our VA hospitals, medical care for our veterans. I will not deny we could use additional funds for our housing, our homeless and our poor.

We could use that, and on and on. We can use additional funds for congregate care for our elderly, there is no question about that. But to actually victimize, completely do away with our total space effort, our future in space and all that holds for this country, I think would be an unwise decision.

As a result, I plan to oppose that amendment when it comes forward, and I think most of the House will recognize that we do need the space station effort to continue in order to continue our future in space.

In closing I would just like to ask the House that when we do get to the amendment stage in the Committee of the Whole, that it oppose the gentleman from New York's amendment and that we continue on with our efforts in space for the future, not only for ourselves but for our children and grandchildren.

Someday I am sure that many of you right now here listening to my voice will not see a person just set foot, again, on the moon, not just that but you will be able to see a person set foot on Mars because that is where we are going.

From the space station we will be going there and we need that additional opportunity now to build that space station as a precursor to our trip to Mars.

I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me the time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, Before I express the concerns I have about the rule for H.R. 2916, I would like to pay tribute to the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA/HUD, Mr. TRAXLER, and the ranking Republican, Mr. GREEN, for the really outstanding job they have done on title I of this bill, the title dealing with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Not long ago, this House went through a grueling ordeal in trying to pass a supplemental appropriations bill for the current fiscal year.

The veterans of America were essentially held hostage during that whole process, which lasted about 2 months.

The good work done on this veterans package in H.R. 2916 should obviate much of the need to do a supplemental bill for veterans next year.

And so every Member is indebted to Mr. TRAXLER and Mr. GREEN for working so diligently to produce a responsible package for our veterans.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the good news about H.R. 2916.

Listen now to the bad news.

This bill reduces the President's request for NASA by over \$1 billion. It then goes on to raise budget authority for subsidized housing by \$1.6 billion over the President's request. All told, taking into account some of the other priorities which were shifted, the administration calculates the outlays under this bill at a level which is \$300 million above the allocation authorized under section 302(b) of the Budget Act.

How then did the Rules Committee respond to this problem? It did so, quite frankly, in a manner that defies rational analysis. The rule we will be voting on makes in order an amendment, by Mr. SCHUMER of New York, which would take yet another \$700 million out of NASA and plow most of this money into—you guessed it—subsidized housing.

I join with my colleague, the distinguished Ranking Republican of the Rules Committee, Mr. QUILLEN, in expressing disbelief at this turn of events. What makes the Rules Committee's action even more puzzling is the fact that another proposed amendment, by Members with much more seniority than Mr. SCHUMER, with all due respect, was turned down cold.

Mr. ROE, the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, and Mr. WALKER, the ranking Republican on that committee, came before the Rules Committee to ask permission to offer a bipartisan amendment shifting funds—about \$35 million to be exact—among several programs in the NASA account that would coincide with their committee's actions. This modest amendment was turned down cold.

I realize that the workings of the Rules Committee are often unexplainable to the uninitiated, but this one really takes the cake. When the distinguished chairman and ranking member of a standing committee are turned down from offering a modest amendment in an area of their own committee's oversight jurisdiction, it becomes a cause for real concern.

If Mr. ROE and Mr. WALKER were going to be treated so arbitrarily, then there is no way the Schumer amendment—which shifts hundreds of millions of dollars through multiple accounts: Housing, EPA, Veterans, and NASA—should have been made in order as an en bloc package. This amendment takes a bill that is already moving in the wrong direction and gives it a further shove the wrong way.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule that is unfair to Members from both sides of the aisle and I hope we can do a lot better on some of the forthcoming rules concerning other appropriations bills that will be coming soon.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would also say that I have even more reservations about the bill itself. I particularly object to the emphasis on taking everything out of NASA's hide. All Americans, all of our constituents, have benefited in countless ways from the commercial applications and spin-offs from the technologies developed in our aerospace programs.

We neglect NASA R&D at our peril. Our national economic vitality and competitive position are at stake in our ongoing efforts to expand the frontiers of high technology. So let's dispense with this false dichotomy between so-called social programs and technological development. The greatest social program our country can offer is a vibrant and growing economy. Let's keep it that way by defeating the previous question unless the agreement is reached before the committee rises.

□ 1050

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I think we have the matter at least in some semblance of order, but like every other thing that happens in a good family, there is a difference of opinion. I think those differences of opinion are manifested very strongly in the situation that we are faced with in the country with the enormous debt we are trying to reduce, and the other items, and to establish the right priorities.

Let me make it clear, if I may, to our distinguished Members that are here, this committee, as an authorizing committee, went before the Committee on Rules and they not only are authorizing, but we are responsible, as Mem-

bers know, for the oversight work and for the constant daily operation of the NASA Program. We went before the Committee on Rules, and we wanted a rule or an amendment in order that what has been en bloc, that would have adjusted certain issues within the confines of our program affecting no other Members' program, taking no money away, and adding no additional money whatsoever. We simply agreed that from this committee's perspective, we are on a day-by-day operation of NASA, and we understand those problems. We felt that at that point that part of the program being recommended by the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee with our distinguished chairman, we felt needed some adjustment. We have been attempting, over a period of time, to get that done. I think we have just come to a conclusion and an agreement with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and our distinguished minority representative and leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

If I might have a dialog with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] for a moment, it is our understanding that we will be offering, under the open section of the rule, three amendments. One amendment would be to strike the language on the establishment, I think of \$14 million in the California project which has not been authorized, and we are going to look into the matter as we agreed to, as far as the authorizing committee is concerned.

Mr. TRAXLER. If the gentleman will yield, this is correct.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the second thing we have agreed to do, with the gentleman's acquiescence, is an amendment that would strike the restrictive language in the National Science Foundation legislation, precluding the use or the implementation of the academic research bill which this committee, meaning the House, voted on last year at 405 in favor and 5 against. It is my understanding that that amendment would be agreed, to strike that restrictive language?

Mr. TRAXLER. If the gentleman will yield, yes, this is the language. Let me say yes to the gentleman and then qualify my response with some further information.

The gentleman is correct, that is part of our agreement. I might add, this language has been in this bill before. It is not new to it, and it represents some concerns that many Members have over allowing NSF to embark upon a brick-and-mortar program that could very seriously jeopardize the basic research that the Foundation does.

The gentleman, as I understand it, is assuring me that in the course of events dealing with his authorization

bill, as he moves that forward, that there will be no effort to change any of the language in the NSF section. NSF is authorized for several more years.

Mr. ROE. We are agreeing to, that we would not put a floor and tamper with that.

Let me say to the distinguished gentleman and our colleagues here, the committee is extremely concerned about that particular piece of legislation. We added that bill and we put that bill together in the trade bill and then we refined it as a body, bipartisanly refined it, and put it into a separate standing piece of legislation.

What was it to do? What is it to do? To provide the resources to the universities, the black colleges, the junior colleges, to start to train our young people and provide the resources for them to be able to learn what they can do in science, space, and technology. That is what those resources are for.

I am willing to work closely, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is with our distinguished chairman, and he has agreed to take that language out. We agree we will not put a floor under that language, and it will be up to the House to decide what, if anything, they chose to appropriate.

Third thing, if I may add, the committee has agreed to put an additional \$20 million into the national aerospace program which would raise that authorization or earmarked funding to \$98 million, and the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking member have agreed with the authorizing committee that they will extend every effort possible to bring those resources up to the \$127 million, which is one-third NASA program, and the balance of those resources to be brought forth by DOD, in their two-thirds responsibility.

That is the understanding?

(On request of Mr. DERRICK and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman correctly stated that point.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, we will join, as we intended, and I want to thank the gentleman for their strong support as far as the amendment is concerned, to strip the funding out of the space station, which we discuss at a different time.

We would then be prepared to offer three amendments when we go into the committee, on the bill, under the provision of the bill covering those three elements. If that is agreeable, we want to support it.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Would the gentleman have patience for a moment to discuss a couple of points here?

I am very appreciative. We do not want to explain too much more here. Let me say to the gentleman that the resistance on the part of the subcommittee toward funding a brick-and-mortar program is based upon a deep concern that all across America every college and university needs a science building or facility. We are confident that there is not enough money in the entire NSF budget to accomplish that purpose. That is our only reservation.

Mr. ROE. I do not disagree with the gentleman. Where we are coming from, if the good folks would read the legislation, the legislation is not brick and mortar per se alone, it provides broad-based authorization for providing, for example, microscopes, if a particular consortium in a school needs it. We ought to know, we wrote the bill.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. I know the gentleman would be thrilled to know we are now providing \$284.7 million for instrumentation and equipment as requested by the President.

Mr. ROE. Good God, this is no time to nitpick on semantics. We are coming back and saying in this House of Representatives, your committee notwithstanding, my committee notwithstanding, they voted 405 to 5, almost unanimously, for that program.

(On request of Mr. DERRICK and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

□ 1100

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into the argument and nitpicking on this, but let me say this one point to the gentleman, that we are distressed as an authorizing committee in part of the testimony coming out of the National Science Foundation on this very issue, and, as an authorizing committee, we will get into that point of view. I am not so sure that the \$2 billion that we provide a year to the National Science Foundation is being spent in the most efficient way in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, without saying any more, I believe we have agreed on our points of interest. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] have one more point?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important point; not to worry, please. I think we ought to have a couple of minutes on this because it is a critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, reading from a letter from the Association of American Universities that was sent yesterday:

We hear that further reductions from the Committee recommended levels of nearly 3 percent may be necessary before the House passes the bill. In this severe budgetary cli-

mate, we must conclude that it would be imprudent, and even irresponsible, of us to support attempts to fund the Academic Research Facilities Modernization program at the expense of the Committee's recommendations for the Foundation's research and education activities.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, if I can reclaim my time, in a communique of July 19 of the American Council on Education:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We strongly support your amendment to remove appropriations language forbidding funding of the new NSF authority for renovation of research facilities. Implementation of this important program is a high priority for America's colleges and universities.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what the Director of NSF has to say about this provision. Incidentally, this language has been our bill before at the director's request. The reason we do this at his request, and at the request of intelligent educators across the country is very simple, we do not have adequate funding to do basic research, let alone a brick and mortar program. If we start a brick and mortar program, every one of my colleagues, every one of the honorable Members of this body, will have a legitimate request that will run this program up to an astronomical sum of money. I have consistently said that if and when we have the funding that will not rob the basic research and education mission of NSF, we will consider this program. It is a good one, but we simply cannot afford it now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's comments, but I do want to indicate the irony of his position. What is really said is we are not going to go forward with the facilities program because the need is so great. It seems a bit self-contradictory.

It was once said of our Lord disparagingly, "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" This was presuming that all wisdom came from Jerusalem.

This is part of the problem with the NSF bureaucracy, as it were, and I say this as a defender and supporter of NSF, but we have had the problem of several major research universities sucking up all the funds to the detriment of others, and the Facilities Modernization Act has very strong criteria which encourages—

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], and no, we do not have that kind of money.

Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY], my good friend, that, if we were to fund this

program, it would be impossible to peer review. The gentleman understands that, does he not? The National Science Foundation cannot peer review 2,289 university requests for facilities with limited funds, \$100 million when there are billions in requests. It would become an authorizing and appropriations bill issue. I can now say to the gentleman that so far we have kept NSF sanitized. We would not be able to do that under these circumstances, as the gentleman well knows. I know that in his district there is a university, a very fine school, which has a need for this kind of facility funding. And I can assure him that the university in my district has the same, and I know the honorable chairman has the same.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a person in this body who could not make a claim legitimately. We cannot meet all of those demands, no matter how worthy they are.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAXLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, that is why in the Modernization Act it has explicit legislative criteria rewarding consortia arrangements between sister institutions so as to reduce the number of these kinds of proposals, and to assume that we do get, in fact, on an equity basis the best return for the public's dollar.

Mrs. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY] assure me that he will work against the across-the-board cut that may be offered at the end of this bill to protect what funding we do have in NSF at this time?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will work against an across-the-board cut insofar as it is consistent with our 302(b) and consistent budgetary applications that we do not transfer back into the previous fiscal year.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY] cannot help me in that end. NSF needs the money, and I am sorry the gentleman cannot help them get it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding, and, Mr. Speaker, anybody who does not believe that there is a difference between the authorization appropriation and the appropriations process in Congress ought to have spent the last 24 hours or so with me. There is a big difference here, and it seems to me that one of the things we ought to do under the rules is accommodate the fact that there are some differences in that area and that we ought to make certain that everyone does have a fair chance

to make their presentation with regard to these issues.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly have a quarrel with the appropriators on this. I have worked over the last few hours with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], the ranking Republican, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] who have attempted to work with those of us on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the authorizing committee, to work out an accommodation here based upon some differences of opinion and priorities, but I got to tell my colleagues that I am very disappointed in what the majority on the Committee on Rules did with regard to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it was entirely legitimate for the Committee on Rules to say we are going to allow no en bloc amendments, that that is not something we can countenance as a part of this process. I think that is an entirely legitimate point to be made.

It is an entirely different matter, however, when there is a bipartisan group from the authorizing committee coming to them for an en bloc amendment which we thought at least identified priorities of ours, to deny us the right to have that amendment offered, and then turn around and offer another Member of the body, who has no jurisdiction in either the authorizing committee or the Appropriations Committee, the right to offer an en bloc amendment that stripped money out of our account.

Mr. Speaker, that is very difficult for us to understand as fairness within the rules process. We think that that is a direct affront to the authorizing process around here where we spend a lot of time trying to become experts in these areas, and I am very disappointed with the kind of process—

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] satisfied with the arrangement that has been worked out?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just said I am very grateful for the fact that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] worked with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] and myself in order to arrive at an agreement, but we had to do that, I will tell the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], despite the rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, we are just giving the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] an opportunity to hone his skills of negotiation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], but that is not what

the rules process is all about. The rules process is to assure that the rules of the House are obeyed and where there is a need for the rules to be circumvented for whatever reason that every Member of this House is treated fairly within the process.

Mr. Speaker, what we have in this particular case is a direct attempt by the Committee on Rules to suggest that the authorizing committee ought not be a part of the process, but that someone else can come in and strip out priorities that has really no jurisdiction in the areas at all.

I do not mind the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] getting his amendment, but, if Mr. SCHUMER is offered an en bloc amendment, then surely the authorizing committee should be offered an en bloc amendment. I do not mind that the authorizing committee is told that we cannot have our en bloc amendment, but then do not give it to another Member. Do not take care of internal politics within the Democratic Party at the expense of bipartisanship in this House because that is what was done here.

Mr. Speaker, this was internal politics within the Democratic Party that was accommodated. The bipartisan authorizing committee was not accommodated. I think that is wrong. I think that that blows ill wind for the future, and I would hope that we would never again see the Committee on Rules put the House in a posture where all of us had to negotiate because the rule was so bad.

□ 1110

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if I may make a meager answer to this very seething indictment of the Rules Committee just a few moments ago, and say that we are dealing with two different propositions here.

The Schumer amendment raised broad priorities and shifts funding. What the Roe-Walker amendment does is try to micromanage various projects, such as the jet propulsion lab project and the flight telerobotic servicer and the extended duration orbiter.

Another difference, and I think this is very important, is that the Schumer amendments could have been offered individually if the Rules Committee had not taken any action. The Roe-Walker amendment could not.

But having said that, I am delighted that the parties have been able to work out a situation that is satisfactory.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERRICK. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman, it is the job of the authorizing committees to micromanage these accounts. That is exactly what authorization is supposed to be all about. We are supposed to set the policy. The appropriators are supposed to be those who within the general scheme of what we decide to do in a policy sense appropriate the money. That is our job.

What the gentleman is criticizing us for is coming to the gentleman's committee and asking for an amendment that allows us to do our job. I find that completely incongruous, particularly when you allow someone to make major policy shifts with the amendment that has no particular knowledge because he does not serve on the committees. That strikes me as being unfair.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], I am not criticizing anybody. I am just staggering that the gentleman has other opportunities to do this micromanagement, and this is not the place for it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the problem is that if the authorizers cannot get out of the gentleman's committee a chance to offer our own amendments en bloc, then it does lock out of the process. I just think that does not make much sense, when you are willing to give somebody the opportunity to come on to the floor and totally obliterate all the work of the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing committee.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have five requests for time, but before I yield, I want to say that since an agreement has been reached on the matter between the committees, I am now happy to support the rule. I will not ask for a recorded vote to vote down the previous question. I want everyone to know that I wholeheartedly support the rule at this time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Let me just say I concur in the remarks of the senior ranking member of the Rules Committee, and really do thank these people for their understanding, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], and all concerned.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I might suggest to those here in the

body, and I am sure there is this saying in Tennessee, it certainly is in South Carolina, that when you have reached an agreement and both parties say yes, it is time to quit talking.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY].

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina that when you are ahead, you ought to quit, and I plan to quit right away. I simply want to support a statement the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] made. In the gentleman's opening remarks, he mentioned the fact that this effort of his was to support the historically black colleges. This morning, I came into my office to find a statement from the president of the United Negro College Fund. He has asked me to bring this to the attention of the Members. It is brief. I shall not be long.

#### UNCF SUPPORTS ROE'S EFFORTS TO FUND NSF FACILITIES PROGRAM

The United Negro College Fund, which represents the 42 private historically black colleges and universities, strongly supports the effort of Representative Robert A. Roe, chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee to remove certain language in H.R. 2916, a bill making FY 1990 appropriations for the Veterans Administration, Housing and Urban Development [HUD] and independent agencies (including the National Science Foundation [NSF]).

Chairman Roe's efforts come as part of a two-stage process to delete language included in the bill which precludes funding for a new program the Congress authorized last year providing funding for facilities at small liberal arts, comprehensive and historically black colleges and universities which train students in mathematics, the natural sciences and engineering. First, the rule (H. Res. 205) must be defeated. Second, the House must adopt a Roe amendment deleting the objectionable language in H.R. 2916.

Congress' enactment of the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act marked the first time that NSF funding has been specifically directed toward the improvement of science education facilities at what some would call "second and third tier" comprehensive and liberal arts institutions. Heretofore, NSF funding, by executive fiat, has been focused on the top 500 large research universities. This concentration of resources in a select few institutions has not resulted in much improvement in the number of American students either pursuing engineering degrees or masters and the Ph.D. degree in mathematics, or the physical or natural sciences. The production of minority undergraduates and graduate degree recipients in these types of institutions is abysmally low.

For example, in 1986 only six black Americans earned the Ph.D. in mathematics and one in computer science, and out of 26,000 Ph.D.s in mathematics only 24 are black females.

We urge your support for both Roe amendments as a means of providing additional funds for the Nation's historically black colleges and universities and many other smaller liberal arts and comprehensive institutions that produce the majority of undergraduate institutions that produce

the majority of undergraduate science and mathematics majors.

Mr. Chairman, this effort on the part of the Members, such as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] must be commended.

I am very pleased that we have reached an agreement, because this is a very, very important issue for the historically black colleges and the small black liberal arts colleges across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman from New Jersey's objection to the rule governing consideration of H.R. 2916, making fiscal year 1990 appropriations for the VA, HUD, and independent agencies. Mr. Roe, my friend and colleague who chairs the Committee on Science and Technology, wants to remove certain language in H.R. 2916, but he is not permitted to do so under the rule. I support his efforts to overturn the rule because the Appropriations Committee has exceeded its authority in directing that no funding be provided for facilities.

Chairman ROE, who served as the principal author of last year's successful reauthorization of the National Science Foundation, has a simple two-part strategy—defeat the rule, House Resolution 208, and then delete the offensive language in H.R. 2916. The offensive language prohibits funding for the New Facilities Program authorized by the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act. This program will provide funding for rehabilitation, construction, and renovation of facilities at small liberal arts, comprehensive, and historically black colleges and universities. Funding for this program is critical to expanding the Nation's capacity to increase its mathematics, physical science, and engineering graduates.

Congress' enactment of the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act marked the first time that NSF funding has been specifically directed toward the improvement of science education facilities at what some would call "second and third tier" comprehensive and liberal arts institutions. Heretofore, NSF funding has, by executive fiat, been focused on the top of 500 large research universities. This concentration of resources in a select few institutions has not resulted in much improvement in the number of American students either pursuing engineering degrees or masters and the Ph.D. degree in mathematics, or the physical or natural sciences. The production of minority undergraduates and graduate degree recipients in these types of institutions is abysmally low.

For example, in 1986 only six black Americans earned the Ph.D. in mathematics and only one in computer sci-

ence. Additionally, out of 26,000 Ph.D.s in mathematics earned at American universities, only 24 are held by black females.

The important fact here is to keep the role played by the nonresearch universities in perspective. Black American students, for example, are concentrated in the Nation's 4-year public and private historically black colleges and universities and 4-year, urban public institutions; while Hispanics are found in large numbers at comprehensive and 4-year public institutions in a few States in the Southwest and West, plus Colorado, Illinois, and New York. Growing numbers of blacks and Hispanics are enrolled in community colleges, but never graduate or go on to complete the baccalaureate degree.

The National Science Foundation's own data outline the problem quite vividly—among white Americans—61 percent—who received a doctorate in science or engineering, there are 50 percent more likely to have received their first degree at a research university or other doctorate degree granting institution than black Americans—40 percent—or Hispanic Americans—41 percent.

Among blacks and Hispanics, their degrees were earned at comprehensive institutions, while Asian Americans received their degrees at a research institution not located in the United States or affiliated with a U.S. college or university—57 percent.

I urge my colleagues to join Chairman ROE in opposing this rule and deleting this language which threatens this Congress' commitment to increasing the number of mathematicians, scientists, and engineers, and expanding the number of minorities and women in these critical occupations.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, just so everyone understands after this long colloquy what we have all agreed to; we have agreed that we would add \$20 million for NASP.

We have agreed that we would strike the language with respect to the JPL project, which the authorizing committee will review in due time, and we have agreed that we would strike the restriction on funding with respect to title II of the NSF authorization legislation.

We have entered into two further agreements which will not show up in the text of the bill as it is ultimately passed by this body: we agree on our part that we are going to fight as hard as we can in the conference to get the additional money for the NASP Program, and the gentleman from New Jersey agrees that he will not try to bring the legislation to the floor which

would put a floor under the bricks and mortar program, and thereby avoid the need to go to the Appropriations Committee with respect to that program.

I think it is a fair deal for those, like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY] who are concerned at the condition of the science facilities in our colleges and universities, like the distinguished chairman of the authorizing committee and its distinguished ranking minority member. Let me assure them that we share that concern.

In fact, as I am sure they know, a significant portion of the money in the NSF research and related activities account has been programmed by the National Science Foundation for instrumentation and major equipment.

I would estimate that when we are done today, there will be something over \$260 million still in the bill that will provide for that funding, assuming that the National Science Foundation continues to program the funds as it has told us it intends to do.

So I want to assure my colleagues that although we have not been able to fund title II of the authorizing legislation, as I think, if we had enough money, we would dearly love to do, the funding under title I does to some degree, not enough we all acknowledge, address the instrumentation and equipment problem.

I thank all who have worked on resolving this issue. I am glad that we managed to do it and spared our colleagues a time-consuming fight. I therefore hope that all of us will now join in passing the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I want to bring to the attention of the House a relatively small, but I think very important issue, which will be discussed on the House floor today. In the context of that issue, this rule is an open rule and permit the amendment that I plan to offer to be offered. The amendment is made in order, although in some sense in somewhat of a circuitous fashion.

The amendment that I will be offering, and I will be joined by other members of the Housing Authorizing Committee, will be to reinstate the priorities that this Congress and the authorizing committee of the Housing Subcommittee has established over the last several years, and that is a priority for providing housing assistance in a tenant-based fashion, so that when we focus on housing assistance, we focus on providing funding directly to low-income residents and giving them the ability to make their own choices, to make their own decisions

on where to live and under what conditions to live.

What the Appropriations Committee has done is that it has increased project-based assistance for new construction of public housing by one-third, from \$5,000 that it had been for several years to \$7,500, at a cost of \$176 million.

I will be offering an amendment to transfer that \$176 million from new construction of public housing where it is not needed, where in fact it is a lower priority and where in fact it does not provide the kind of choices to low-income residents that the tenant-based assistance does, to transfer that to the tenant-based section 8 certificates, doubling the number of families that we can assist, increasing the number of families that we would be assisting from 2,500 to 5,500, and providing a replacement pool with those 5,500 tenant-based certificates to be used to replace those expiring 221-D-3's and 236's of current law.

□ 1120

The result of this amendment would be to reinstate the concept of the priority of tenant-based assistance to stop the appropriations bill from rewriting Federal housing priorities as this bill does and to reinstate the concept of tenant-based assistance, of tenant-based section 8 certificates, so the amendment does not cut money. It does not add to nor does it delete from the budget authority of this bill. It merely transfers the \$176 million increase from new construction into an equivalent dollar amount for section 8 certificates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I remember when I stood here making a speech arguing that "a deal is a deal" on the Federal savings and loan bill, and I did not have much luck. I hope this deal is a deal and that it will work out. I am sure it will.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to see that the Appropriations Committee included in its report on H.R. 2916, the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies appropriations bill, a statement urging that the National Science Foundation [NSF] make available up to \$1,500,000 for computing capabilities not available at national supercomputer centers. The committee also acknowledged that since the national centers may not meet all research requirements, funding should be available for propos-

als to utilize supercomputer facilities which are not designated as national centers.

NSF advanced scientific computer and networking programs are of vital importance to the Nation. Congress should be commended for the strong support it has demonstrated in the past for supercomputer programs and scientific research. This support is increasingly critical to the economic competitiveness of the United States. Technologies such as supercomputers are already indispensable in some areas of research, and, with rapid technological advance, will offer even more powerful and far-reaching capabilities in the future. In turn, these technological advances can be applied to products and services in order to keep this country at the cutting edge of international economic leadership.

In May, yet another domestic maker of high performance supercomputers announced that it was discontinuing its manufacturing in this area. In order to maintain U.S. leadership in this important area, we must continue to support and encourage supercomputers and associated networks.

This year, as in recent years, I have urged Congress and the NSF to put as much emphasis on accessibility to this technology as it does to keeping newer centers modernized. I have urged the provision of adequate funding for the NSF phase I supercomputer centers. Colorado State University [CSU] in Fort Collins, CO, is widely acknowledged as the first university in the country to purchase and operate a supercomputer. Since 1981, CSU has operated a supercomputer research center for its own sophisticated research needs and for those of a wide array of remote users. And while it led the field in this area for many years, loss of critical NSF support has had a detrimental impact on the entire research community which depends upon access to its center.

In 1984, the NSF Advanced Scientific Computing Initiative selected three universities—Colorado State, the University of Minnesota, and Purdue University—to provide supercomputer resource access to the NSF and other academic researchers.

Funding for these phase I centers has decreased markedly in recent years as a result of NSF support for a phase II program and five new centers. This is unfortunate for several reasons. These phase I centers have succeeded in providing quality access for thousands of university researchers to supercomputing facilities and cycles across the country. Moreover, this access has provided significant and tangible research results as well as training for scientific research. The evidence in support of the benefits of supercomputers is impressive and growing, particularly in the areas of science and engineering research. Consequently, my hope is that we will continue to recognize the importance of maintaining our commitment to advanced high performance supercomputing and the vital communications networks on which these machines and our entire scientific research community depends.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, on June 19, 13 of our colleagues joined me in writing to Chairman TRAXLER regarding our concern with the shortage of safe, sanitary and decent housing in Indian and Alaskan native commu-

nities. We urge the funding of a minimum of 2,000 units in fiscal year 1990.

Nearly one-fourth of the American Indian population lives in substandard housing. It is well documented that decent housing is a critical important ingredient in improving and maintaining healthy families. In my home State of Montana, 1988 statistics just released state that 14 percent of the infant mortality rate applies to Indians although they make up only 5 percent of Montana's population.

Between 1987 and 1988 the Bureau of Indian Affairs reported a 6-percent increase in substandard housing; however since 1981, funding for Indian housing has been cutback by nearly 80 percent. The inclusion of 1,000 units in the budget before us today is less than the fiscal year 1989 level of 1,243 units. We are moving backwards.

We are well aware of the budget constraints facing the Nation. I'm sure my colleagues will agree however that unsafe and unsanitary housing simply adds more to what we spend for medical attention.

I urge my colleagues to remember the compelling need for Indian housing units. Should the Senate include additional funds I urge my colleagues to support a higher number of units in conference than the 1,000 units contained within H.R. 2916.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, not long ago the Chesapeake Bay was near death. This national treasure, whose waters provided food for our dinner table, recreation for our families, and a livelihood for so many of our communities was on its last leg from years of uncontrolled activities.

Recognizing this tragedy, the Federal Government joined with State and local governments in an unprecedented effort to cleanup the bay. Initial studies showed that pollution acted as a nutrient that enhanced rapid algae growth in the bay. As the algae grew, it consumed greater and greater quantities of oxygen from the water. Of course, marine life found it difficult to survive in an environment with a diminished oxygen supply.

Surprisingly we learned that one of the greatest sources for this pollution was in the form of runoff from agricultural pesticide use, animal waste from feed lots and poultry operations, and everyday use of chemicals and detergents in homes and businesses—located hundreds of miles away from the bay. The problem was much more complex than we had ever imagined.

This realization led to two important events. In December 1987 the Environmental Protection Agency, the States of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania as well as the District of Columbia signed an agreement to reduce and control point and non-point sources of pollution in order to improve the health of the bay. They agreed to develop, adopt, and begin implementation of a basinwide strategy to achieve at least a 40 percent reduction in these harmful pollutants entering the bay by the year 2000.

That same year Congress passed the water quality act that was to pave the way for the attainment of these goals. This plan requires each State to study the effects of non-point source pollution and develop a management plan to reduce this pollution. The last 2 years, though this program was authorized for funding, it did not receive a single penny. Last

year I was to offer an amendment with my colleague from Minnesota, Mr. OBERSTAR, that would have transferred \$25 million into this program. It was withdrawn for lack of support. As Congress frittered time away, the threat to the bay grew by the day.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased with the progress we have made this year. We have shown that our efforts the last 2 years have not been in vain. This year's appropriations bill shows a greater wisdom by allocating \$80 million to this worthwhile program. Today marks a giant step toward not only the revitalization of the Chesapeake Bay but also a great advancement in our efforts to protect and enhance the entire Nation's water quality. I applaud the Appropriations Committee for their hard work in this area and urge my colleagues to support this provision of the bill. It is high time Congress lived up to its commitment to the Chesapeake Bay.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2916, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1990

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2916) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1124

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2916, with Mr. BEILENSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I would like to express my deep personal gratification and thanks to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and to the ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE]. Their good counsel, advice, and support have enabled me to go through this difficult process the first time out of the chute managing, I think, a difficult bill under trying circumstances.

Regretfully, we do not have enough money to fund the full needs of the departments, agencies, and fine programs which are in this bill. I must tell you that the choices and tradeoffs were extremely difficult.

I would also extend my appreciation to the members of the subcommittee. And I want to especially thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for his very generous support, for his gentlemanliness, for his knowledge of the subject matter. In whole, I consider him one of the most outstanding Members of this body.

The members of the subcommittee deserve their moment, and I want to tell the Members how appreciative I am to each and every one of them, Republican and Democrat alike.

I must also tell the Members that it is with deep regret that I advise them that the subcommittee clerk, Dick Malow, is not here with us on the floor today. I'm sorry to say his mother just passed away. I might add that this is the first time Dick has not been on the floor with this bill in some 17 years. He is an outstanding employee of this body. He is totally dedicated to public service and the public good, and I deeply regret the sorrow and the circumstances surrounding his absence.

I am very appreciative of the other subcommittee staff and the fine work that they have done. And I should add, that the full committee staff have done an exceptionally fine job in assisting us in learning the paths we must travel to complete the process of sending a bill to the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we bring to the House today the 1990 VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill. The bill provides some \$65.1 billion in new budget authority for the fiscal year 1990. That amount is \$2,364,461,635 above the President's request and \$4,520,369,000 above the 1989 appropriations level.

As the bill currently stands, it is within the subcommittee's section 302(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. Indeed, we are nearly \$5 million in budget authority and nearly \$2 million in outlays below our section 302(b) allocation, and at the appropriate time I will offer amendments which utilize that remaining allocation.

Let me say in addressing the outlay allocation issue first, the section 302(b) allocation for the subcommittee was about \$1.5 billion short in outlays—that is if we were to fund the President's requested increase for NASA, a 24-percent increase, and the National Science Foundation increase of 14 percent above last year, and if we were to restore the VA medical care account to a current services level, and this body and its Members are dedicated to that. I believe that that is what the subcommittee and the full committee would have liked to do. However, in seeking to do that, again, we were \$1.5 billion short in outlays.

We have explored various savings measures, and with some success. We have been able to close that \$1.5 billion gap by about \$1 billion, and the largest single scorekeeping change was to move the pay date for VA, NASA, and EPA from the first part of October to September 29. This is the same technique being used by Secretary Cheney for DOD.

OMB wants to score it for DOD, and they are going to permit the Treasury to issue the checks early for DOD. But they refuse to do the same, I might add, for the domestic agencies, and I strongly protest that unfairness. We will hear more about this later at the appropriate time. I am sure the Members do not believe that that is a fair approach. I am also sure that Members believe that DOD will get their scorekeeping gimmick.

In any instance, my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, will move to strike the language changing the pay date on a point of order. We will discuss it either at that point or later as we approach

what will probably be an across-the-board cut.

But even with the \$359 million in outlay savings that we get from moving the pay date, this bill was still short by at least \$500 million, in necessary outlays. That means we had to cut more than \$1 billion, in budget authority from various programs, a very, very difficult task.

We cut NASA by \$1,011 million, and I take no pleasure in that. But we did preserve the space station. We cut the National Science Foundation's requested additions by more than \$150 million. But, the amount recommended for basic research and education is still \$133,500,000 above the 1989 levels. I wish we could have given them every penny requested.

We cut Superfund by more than \$300 million, but still provide a slight increase above the 1989 appropriation. And we have offset those cuts by one or two additions.

We provided, as the first priority, sufficient money in 1990 for VA medical care to assure that we do not have to come back next year for a supplemental if this bill passes in its current form. If we come out of conference with less money, if the Senate does not agree with this top priority of the House's and we are forced to make some reduction there, I can foresee a supplemental request in this area.

□ 1130

We are committed to fully providing for the medical needs of America's deserving veterans. I hope that the President in his budget message to us next January will recognize that priority and fully fund VA medical care needs. That would go a long way to alleviating the problems that this subcommittee has.

The funds recommends in this bill, \$820 million, above the budget request, will maintain current hospital staffing at a level of 194,720 FTEE's. And let me tell my colleagues that the staffing level is the key, because hospitals, as everyone knows, are personnel-intensive. We need to keep those people there to provide those services. Their numbers are not now sufficient in relationship to the ever-increasing demands because of our aging World War II veteran population.

We added over \$100 million, for EPA's operating programs which, by the way, is not anywhere near enough, given all of the programs that the authorizing committees have been pumping out in the last few years. Given the fact that this President tells us he is strongly interested in the environment, as is this committee and as is every Member of this Congress, we should be adding something like, and here is a target for Members, something like \$300 million to EPA in my judgment. But the allocation and the

desire to present a balanced bill do not permit us to do that at this time. I hope in another year we will be able to do that. I hope the funding will be made available.

We have added \$2,233,753,635 above the request for programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Of that amount, \$1,092,112,375 is for renewing expiring housing contracts. I recognize this is a lot of money. It is necessary, in my judgment, to continue providing subsidies for families in assisted housing.

I also might mention that while the renewal number is large in 1990, it is going to be many times that next year. Next year, just to provide funds to renew expiring section 8 contracts will require somewhere between \$10 billion and \$24 billion—and that will not provide for one additional subsidized unit. It will only provide for the renewal of expiring contracts.

The other large increase in HUD is \$425,848,000 for housing for the elderly or the handicapped program. Those funds will provide for approximately 8,500 units. It is a decrease of about

1,000 units from the level provided in 1989, and I regret that.

We have added \$75,000,000 for public housing operating subsidies, a very necessary sum to preserve the physical inventory of public housing buildings. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for being a strong supporter of that addition.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, this bill does not do everything for NASA that either I, the subcommittee, or the full committee would like—and certainly not what the authorizers would like. But, the increase provided equates to about a 15-percent increase over last year, and that is quite remarkable when one considers the overall increase in discretionary domestic programs across the board is about 4 percent, which just takes inflation into account for a current services level.

The fact is we made a valiant effort within the 302(b) allocation given to us to fund the space station. And we have been able to do that, not to everyone's satisfaction, not to the levels

that they would expect, or want or need, but we have been able to do it. It has been tough on some other NASA programs. It is tough on other programs within the subcommittee's jurisdiction. However, we hope there will be opportunities for improvements on this bill as we negotiate with the Senate.

I want to close by telling Members that this bill will inevitably undergo some substantial changes in conference, changes that probably some of us will not like, will not be pleased with, but it is inevitable.

I also would say that if an across-the-board cut succeeds today, we are driving down the outlays in an incredible fashion. I will ask Members when we get to that point not to do that. The reason is due to the pending determination of the outcome on the DOD issue. I promise I will have more to say about that at the appropriate time.

I will include a table comparing the amounts recommended with the 1989 appropriations and the revised 1990 budget requests at this point.

	FY 1989 Enacted	FY 1990 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I					
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Benefits Administration					
Compensation and pensions .....	15,460,581,000	15,367,506,000	15,367,506,000	-93,075,000	.....
Readjustment benefits .....	619,812,000	434,100,000	434,100,000	-185,712,000	.....
Veterans insurance and indemnities .....	9,220,000	13,940,000	13,940,000	+4,720,000	.....
Loan guaranty revolving fund .....	778,100,000	453,000,000	453,000,000	-325,100,000	.....
Direct loan revolving fund (limitation on direct loans) .....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	.....	.....
Subtotal, Veterans Benefits Administration .....	16,867,713,000	16,268,546,000	16,268,546,000	-599,167,000	.....
Veterans Health Service and Research Administration					
Medical care .....	10,882,671,000	10,741,431,000	11,561,431,000	+678,760,000	+820,000,000
(By transfer) .....	(5,000,000)	.....	.....	(-5,000,000)	.....
Medical and prosthetic research .....	210,241,000	197,310,000	211,000,000	+759,000	+13,690,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses .....	47,909,000	48,541,000	48,541,000	+632,000	.....
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines .....	500,000	500,000	500,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Veterans Health Service and Research Administration .....	11,141,321,000	10,987,782,000	11,821,472,000	+680,151,000	+833,690,000
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses .....	784,216,000	803,559,000	805,059,000	+20,843,000	+1,500,000
(By transfer) .....	(15,000,000)	.....	.....	(-15,000,000)	.....
Office of the Inspector General .....	.....	22,249,000	22,249,000	+22,249,000	.....
Construction, major projects .....	363,040,000	365,849,000	417,549,000	+54,509,000	+51,700,000
Construction, minor projects .....	111,596,000	114,699,000	113,699,000	+2,103,000	-1,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(41,731,000)	(45,136,000)	(44,136,000)	(+2,405,000)	(-1,000,000)
Parking garage revolving fund .....	26,000,000	7,075,000	29,375,000	+3,375,000	+22,300,000
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities .....	42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	.....	.....
Grants for construction to State veterans cemeteries .....	9,000,000	4,356,000	4,356,000	-4,644,000	.....
Subtotal, Departmental Administration .....	1,335,852,000	1,359,787,000	1,434,287,000	+98,435,000	+74,500,000
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs .....	29,344,886,000	28,616,115,000	29,524,305,000	+179,419,000	+908,190,000
TITLE II					
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
HOUSING PROGRAMS					
Annual contributions for assisted housing .....	7,538,765,000	7,592,594,365	9,145,000,000	+1,606,235,000	+1,552,405,635
Rescission of assisted housing deobligations (budget authority, indefinite) .....	-313,500,000	-221,500,000	-221,500,000	+92,000,000	.....
Total, annual contributions for assisted housing (net) .....	7,225,265,000	7,371,094,365	8,923,500,000	+1,698,235,000	+1,552,405,635
Rental rehabilitation grants .....	150,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000	-20,000,000	.....
Rental housing assistance:					
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite .....	-50,000,000	-48,000,000	-48,000,000	+2,000,000	.....
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite) .....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	.....	.....
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund:					
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(480,106,000)	(32,000,000)	(480,106,000)	.....	(+448,106,000)
Authority to borrow, indefinite .....	428,998,000	.....	425,848,000	-3,150,000	+425,848,000
Congregate services .....	5,400,000	.....	6,000,000	+600,000	+6,000,000
Payments for operation of low-income housing projects .....	1,617,508,000	1,694,200,000	1,769,200,000	+151,692,000	+75,000,000
(By transfer) .....	(88,000,000)	.....	.....	(-88,000,000)	.....
Housing counseling assistance .....	3,500,000	.....	3,500,000	.....	+3,500,000
Flexible subsidy fund .....	.....	35,000,000	.....	.....	-35,000,000
Emergency shelter grants program .....	46,500,000	125,000,000	125,000,000	+78,500,000	.....
Transitional and supportive housing demonstration program .....	80,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	+25,000,000	.....
Supplemental assistance for facilities to assist the homeless .....	.....	11,000,000	11,000,000	+11,000,000	.....
Interagency Council on the Homeless .....	1,100,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	+100,000	.....
Federal Housing Administration Fund .....	237,720,000	350,093,000	350,093,000	+112,373,000	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(96,000,000,000)	(67,000,000,000)	(67,000,000,000)	(-29,000,000,000)	.....
Temporary mortgage assistance payments (limitation on direct loans) .....	(103,350,000)	(88,600,000)	(88,600,000)	(-14,750,000)	.....
Total, Federal Housing Administration Fund .....	237,720,000	350,093,000	350,093,000	+112,373,000	.....
Nonprofit sponsor assistance (limitation on direct loans) .....	(960,000)	(910,000)	(1,100,000)	(+140,000)	(+190,000)
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities (limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(144,000,000,000)	(75,000,000,000)	(75,000,000,000)	(-69,000,000,000)	.....
Total, Housing Programs (net) .....	9,745,991,000	9,774,587,365	11,802,341,000	+2,056,350,000	+2,027,753,635

	FY 1989 Enacted	FY 1990 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
<b>COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT</b>					
Community development grants .....	2,650,000,000	2,744,000,000	2,950,000,000	+300,000,000	+206,000,000
(By transfer) .....	(350,000,000)	(136,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(-300,000,000)	(-86,000,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(144,000,000)		(46,000,000)	(-98,000,000)	(+46,000,000)
Urban development action grants .....					
Urban homesteading .....	13,200,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	-1,200,000	
Total, Community Planning and Development .....	2,663,200,000	2,756,000,000	2,962,000,000	+298,800,000	+206,000,000
<b>POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH</b>					
Research and technology .....	17,200,000	21,400,000	21,400,000	+4,200,000	
<b>FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY</b>					
Fair housing activities .....	10,000,000	12,753,000	12,753,000	+2,753,000	
<b>MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Salaries and expenses .....	335,081,000	341,252,000	341,252,000	+6,171,000	
(By transfer) .....	(3,490,000)			(-3,490,000)	
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds) .....	381	528	0		355
Office of the Inspector General .....		22,681,000	22,681,000	+22,681,000	
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds) .....		6	431	0	
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net) .....	12,771,472,000	12,928,673,365	15,162,427,000	+2,390,955,000	+2,233,753,635
Appropriations .....	(12,705,974,000)	(13,198,173,365)	(15,006,079,000)	(+2,300,105,000)	(+1,807,905,635)
Authority to borrow .....	(428,998,000)		(425,848,000)	(-3,150,000)	(+425,848,000)
Rescissions .....	(-363,500,000)	(-269,500,000)	(-269,500,000)	(+94,000,000)	
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite) .....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)		
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(584,416,000)	(121,510,000)	(569,806,000)	(-14,610,000)	(+448,296,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(240,144,000,000)	(142,000,000,000)	(142,046,000,000)	(-98,098,000,000)	(+46,000,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended) .....	(381,528,000)	(362,277,000)	(362,277,000)	(-19,251,000)	
<b>TITLE III</b>					
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>					
<b>AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION</b>					
Salaries and expenses .....	15,085,000	14,507,000	15,000,000	-85,000	+493,000
<b>CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION</b>					
Salaries and expenses .....	34,500,000	33,479,000	35,500,000	+1,000,000	+2,021,000
<b>COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS</b>					
Salaries and expenses .....	3,100,000	1,462,000	3,000,000	-100,000	+1,538,000
<b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL</b>					
<b>Cemeterial Expenses, Army</b>					
Salaries and expenses .....	13,195,000	12,569,000	12,569,000	-626,000	
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</b>					
Salaries and expenses .....	810,000,000	868,583,000	874,583,000	+64,583,000	+6,000,000
Office of the Inspector General .....		31,734,000	31,734,000		
Research and development .....	202,500,000	235,000,000	241,500,000	+39,000,000	+6,500,000
Abatement, control, and compliance .....	724,625,000	700,000,000	785,000,000	+85,000,000	+85,000,000
Buildings and facilities .....	8,000,000	8,000,000	12,000,000	+4,000,000	+4,000,000
Subtotal, operating programs .....	1,745,125,000	1,843,317,000	1,944,817,000	+199,692,000	+101,500,000
Hazardous substance superfund .....	1,425,000,000	1,739,683,000	1,425,000,000		-314,683,000
Rescission .....	-15,000,000			+15,000,000	
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(190,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(+30,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
Leaking underground storage tank trust fund .....	50,000,000	100,000,000	76,000,000	+26,000,000	-24,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(5,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	
Construction grants .....	1,950,000,000	1,200,000,000	2,024,000,000	+74,000,000	+824,000,000
Rescission .....			-47,700,000	-47,700,000	-47,700,000
Total, Environmental Protection Agency .....	5,155,125,000	4,883,000,000	5,422,117,000	+266,992,000	+539,117,000
<b>EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT</b>					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality .....	850,000	861,000	861,000	+11,000	
National Space Council .....		563,000	1,200,000	+1,200,000	+637,000
Office of Science and Technology Policy .....	1,587,000	2,027,000	2,027,000	+440,000	
Total, Executive Office of the President .....	2,437,000	3,451,000	4,088,000	+1,651,000	+637,000

	FY 1989 Enacted	FY 1990 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
<b>FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY</b>					
Disaster relief.....	100,000,000	270,000,000	100,000,000		-170,000,000
Salaries and expenses.....	137,274,000	141,329,000	141,329,000	+4,055,000	
Emergency management planning and assistance.....	282,438,000	268,505,000	271,160,000	-11,278,000	+2,655,000
Office of the Inspector General.....		2,439,000	2,439,000	+2,439,000	
Emergency food and shelter program.....	114,000,000	134,000,000	134,000,000	+20,000,000	
(By transfer).....	(12,000,000)			(-12,000,000)	
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	633,712,000	816,273,000	648,928,000	+15,216,000	-167,345,000
<b>GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Consumer Information Center.....	1,354,000	1,360,000	1,360,000	+6,000	
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(1,736,000)	(2,092,000)	(2,092,000)	(+356,000)	
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</b>					
Office of Consumer Affairs.....	1,708,000	1,988,000	1,888,000	+180,000	-100,000
<b>NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Research and development.....	4,191,700,000	5,751,600,000	5,203,100,000	+1,011,400,000	-548,500,000
Rescission.....	-25,000,000			+25,000,000	
Space flight, control and data communications.....	4,364,200,000	5,139,600,000	4,709,600,000	+345,400,000	-430,000,000
Construction of facilities.....	290,100,000	341,800,000	384,300,000	+94,200,000	+42,500,000
Science, space and technology education trust fund (by transfer).....	(15,000,000)			(-15,000,000)	
Research and program management.....	1,855,000,000	2,032,200,000	1,957,200,000	+102,200,000	-75,000,000
(By transfer).....	(35,000,000)			(-35,000,000)	
Office of the Inspector General.....		8,795,000	8,795,000	+8,795,000	
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (net).....	10,676,000,000	13,273,995,000	12,262,995,000	+1,586,995,000	-1,011,000,000
<b>NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Central liquidity facility: (Limitation on direct loans).....	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)		
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds).....	(880,000)	(864,000)	(864,000)	(-16,000)	
<b>NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES</b>					
National Institute of Building Sciences.....			500,000	+500,000	+500,000
<b>NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION</b>					
Research and related activities.....	1,620,500,000	1,803,022,000	1,715,000,000	+94,500,000	-88,022,000
Program development and management (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(89,800,000)	(104,000,000)	(97,000,000)	(+7,200,000)	(-7,000,000)
United States Antarctic Program activities.....	131,000,000	156,000,000	74,000,000	-57,000,000	-82,000,000
Science education activities.....	171,000,000	190,000,000	210,000,000	+39,000,000	+20,000,000
Total, National Science Foundation.....	1,922,500,000	2,149,022,000	1,999,000,000	+76,500,000	-150,022,000
<b>NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION</b>					
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.....	19,494,000	14,581,000	21,260,000	+1,766,000	+6,679,000
(By transfer).....		(6,679,000)			(-6,679,000)
<b>SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	26,313,000	26,313,000	26,313,000		
Total, title III, Independent Agencies: New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	18,504,523,000	21,232,000,000	20,454,518,000	+1,949,995,000	-777,482,000
Appropriations.....	(18,544,523,000)	(21,232,000,000)	(20,502,218,000)	(+1,957,695,000)	(-729,782,000)
Rescission.....	(40,000,000)		(47,700,000)	(-7,700,000)	(-47,700,000)
(By transfer).....	(62,000,000)	(6,679,000)		(-62,000,000)	(-6,679,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(286,536,000)	(312,092,000)	(325,092,000)	(+38,556,000)	(+13,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)		
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended).....	(880,000)	(864,000)	(864,000)	(-16,000)	
<b>TITLE IV</b>					
<b>CORPORATIONS</b>					
Federal Home Loan Bank Board: (Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds).....	(31,942,000)	(33,464,000)		(-31,942,000)	(-33,464,000)
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, (limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds).....	(1,667,000)	(1,748,000)		(-1,667,000)	(-1,748,000)
Total, title IV, Corporations.....	(33,609,000)	(35,212,000)		(-33,609,000)	(-35,212,000)

	FY 1989 Enacted	FY 1990 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	60,620,881,000	62,776,788,365	65,141,250,000	+4,520,369,000	+2,364,461,635
Appropriations.....	(60,595,383,000)	(63,046,288,365)	(65,032,602,000)	(+4,437,219,000)	(+1,986,313,635)
Authority to borrow.....	(428,998,000)		(425,848,000)	(-3,150,000)	(+425,848,000)
Rescissions.....	(-403,500,000)	(-269,500,000)	(-317,200,000)	(+86,300,000)	(-47,700,000)
(By transfer).....	(523,490,000)	(142,679,000)	(50,000,000)	(-473,490,000)	(-92,679,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(328,267,000)	(357,228,000)	(369,228,000)	(+40,961,000)	(+12,000,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite).....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)		
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,185,416,000)	(722,510,000)	(1,170,806,000)	(-14,610,000)	(+448,296,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(240,144,000,000)	(142,000,000,000)	(142,046,000,000)	(-98,098,000,000)	(+46,000,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended).....	(416,017,000)	(398,353,000)	(363,141,000)	(-52,876,000)	(-35,212,000)

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, let me say that it was not an easy task to fill the shoes left by the distinguished former chairman of our subcommittee, our former colleague, Mr. Boland, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has done it. He has done it with grace, with good humor in the face of overwhelming problems, and with great skill. We can all be proud of the bill he is bringing to the floor today.

Having said that, we all acknowledge that the bill has problems. The distinguished chairman has already explained in considerable detail the ups and downs of the bill, and I should rather use my time to try to give Members and the House as a whole some feeling for the problems we faced as we put this bill together.

In the first place, we faced the fact that the total 302(b) allocation for our subcommittee, generous though it was, and we certainly have no complaints at the decision of the distinguished chairman of the full Appropriations Committee or of our colleagues in the full committee in terms of our allocation, but generous though it was under the circumstances, it left us a couple hundred million below what the administration has initially requested for the programs within our jurisdiction.

Compounding that was the fact that after the administration had sent in its budget request, we all learned, and the administration now acknowledges, that its request for VA medical facilities was short in outlays by some three-quarters of \$1 billion compared with what we need to keep that program going. I want to tell Members that it is a vital program. My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and I recall when our State health commissioner, Dr. Axelrod came down here, and pleaded with us to get the money for the VA medical system, because it was such an integral part of the overall delivery of care in New York State. We are facing a very serious crisis in health care delivery, and the fact that the VA hospitals are

there serving the veterans is a most critical thing in our State.

So we know we have to provide that extra money, and we have provided it. If we can hold that money in conference, we hope we will not have to be back here for a supplemental next year. But that already puts us \$1 billion short in outlays.

In addition to that, the administration came to us and said, "We undercounted the amount of money we need to replace expiring housing subsidy contracts." So we had to respond to that administration request, because we are not going to have people in subsidized housing or with rent certificates being thrown out on the street. So that drove us up still more.

If a point of order is not made against the pay shift provision, then we shall indeed have complied not only with our budget authority limitation, but also with our outlay limitation. However, we know that point of order will be offered, and we know that it will be sustained by the Chair. As a result, though we still are below the ceiling in our budget authority, we are above, to the tune of about \$359 million, the limit on our outlays. We understand that fully, and we fully intend to come back from conference to this House with a bill that meets all our obligations under the Budget Act and under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

We ask our colleagues' indulgence at this stage of the process in permitting the bill to pass without an across-the-board reduction. Across-the-board reductions are not the way to deal with the many varied, complicated programs we have in this bill.

I should point out that we may in the conference face a situation where in fact the pay shift is allowed. I understand the Democratic leadership in the House is, at this time at least, taking a position that, if it is ultimately allowed for the Defense Department, we shall be permitted the same treatment.

□ 1140

If that should happen, our problem is resolved.

Though it is not permissible under the rules to anticipate what will

happen in the other body, I think I can report that already the other body's 302(b) allocation has some things which make it different from ours and, in conference, we may be able to use that as a means of resolving a good part of the \$359 million problem we are facing today.

So I do ask the House to bear with us. We acknowledge our problems. We pledge to the House that if you will bear with us today we shall deal with them as we get to conference.

I should now like to address a point which I am sure we shall debate at a greater length as the day unfolds, but, since it was raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] during the debate on the rule, I think the Members ought to have a response.

The gentleman from Texas represented to the House that our bill constituted a reversal of a policy that had been adopted by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs in its authorizing legislation for HUD programs. He described that reversal of policy as the fact that we were increasing the number of units assisted by project-based subsidies whereas in fact it had been the policy of the Committee on Banking to reduce them.

The gentleman is in error when he tells you that we have increased the number of project-based subsidies. That is just not true.

We have reduced the number of units in project-based subsidies in this bill by 1,442 units compared with the current fiscal year legislation that Congress has enacted.

So we are in no way trying to usurp the role of the Committee on Banking. We have been quite consistent with that in reducing the total number of project-based units by 1,442.

The dilemma we faced is that a portion of those project-based units in the current fiscal year bill, 2,942 to be precise, were in the section 8 moderate rehab program.

Now anyone who reads the front page of the papers knows that the section 8 moderate rehab program is one of those programs where there are terrible problems at HUD. We did not want to appropriate money for that

program until HUD fixes it. I do not think there is anyone here in this House who would disagree with that decision.

But that left us with the dilemma that, if we are going to continue to have some project-based units, reflecting the mix that the Banking Committee's authorizing legislation provides, we had to deal with the section 8 moderate rehab situation which frankly the Banking Committee had obviously not contemplated when it put together its legislation.

So we took a portion of those 2,942 units, to be exact 2,500 of them, and we put them instead in the public housing program because that is the only other family-oriented project-based program that the Committee on Banking has given us.

They abolished the section 8 new construction program, and they have abolished the section 8 substantial rehabilitation program.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding for a clarification.

I know we will have the debate. I respect the gentleman's point.

Mr. Chairman, for clarification, the gentleman does concur that in essence that the public housing new construction in prior years had been at the 5,000 new unit level and the committee increased that to 7,500 units and that amount of money could have funded about 5,500 section 8 certificates.

Mr. GREEN. There is no doubt that you can fund more section 8 certificates than you can fund moderate rehabs, substantial rehabs, new construction, I would never quarrel with that fact.

The fact of the matter is we have funded fewer project-based units this year in this bill than the current bill under which we are operating, the fiscal year 1989 bill, provides.

I think everyone in this House should understand that. We have not reversed the policy of the Committee on Banking. We are in fact lower in project-based units this year than we were for the fiscal year 1989.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman would yield just briefly.

Mr. GREEN. Just briefly because there are others who would like to speak.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman. But the committee did increase the new construction of public housing by one-third, from 5,000—

Mr. GREEN. In fact by one-half, from 5,000 to 7,500. We did that simply to replace the moderate rehab units. We did not want to fund a program having so much difficulty. We did want to keep some project-based programs as indeed the Committee on Banking contemplates we should. So

given the crisis in the section 8 moderate rehab program, we took the only other family-based project program that the Committee on Banking gives us and we utilized that while at the same time continuing to use the project-based units overall.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2916, the fiscal year 1990 appropriations bill for VA, HUD, and independent agencies. Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth car of the appropriations express, and I am proud to be on board. I want to congratulate my dear and beloved friend, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable BOB TRAXLER, for the outstanding job he has done during his maiden voyage as chairman of the VA-HUD subcommittee. Throughout this process, the gentleman has been fair but firm.

And he has somehow managed to load twenty pounds of programs, into a ten-pound sack.

I would also like to recognize my distinguished colleague from New York, the ranking member of the subcommittee, the Honorable BILL GREEN. Working with the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee, the gentleman has never shied away from the difficult choices. He has always exercised his very best judgment in balancing the diverse national priorities reflected in the VA-HUD bill.

Although H.R. 2916 is, on balance, a good bill, I do have some serious concerns about the legislation. The billions of dollars in this bill appropriated to NASA research and development generally, and to the space station specifically, commits us to a future course of multi-multibillion-dollar spending for programs included in this year's bill. As we have yet to articulate a clear space policy, this commitment seems premature. Of more serious concern, we have no idea where the money to finance these grandiose programs is going to come from.

If you think money is tight this year, just wait until next year. And if we keep pumping billions upon billions of dollars into space programs without a clear sense of purpose, we will further restrict our ability to home the homeless, feed the hungry and educate our young.

Also, if certain provisions of this bill are struck on points of order, the bill will substantially exceed the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation for outlays. According to the administration's mid-session budget review, it is imperative to stay within the outlay allocations to avoid sequestration. It is our duty to

make the hard choices necessary to avoid such an action, and I submit that we should take a hard look at programs, such as the space station, that promise to consume billions of dollars of unidentifiable origin.

H.R. 2916 is the product of countless hours of hard work, and the entire subcommittee on VA-HUD-independent agencies is to be congratulated on its dedication.

Although the bill may not satisfy any of us in all of its particulars, the collective judgment of the Appropriations Committee has produced a bill that is balanced, fair and attentive to our most critical national needs. I am particularly pleased that the bill contains \$11.56 billion for VA medical care. During consideration of the recently enacted supplemental, we sent a clear signal that we were determined to reverse the decline of the VA medical care system; this bill provides the Department of Veterans Affairs with the tools it needs to begin that important job. I commend the members of the committee for honoring our sacred trust with this Nation's veterans.

I am also pleased that this bill designates the Office of Science and Technology Policy as the lead agency to coordinate governmentwide activities associated with Decade of the Brain. When Congress enacted legislation this session to proclaim the 1990s as the Decade of the Brain, it promoted awareness of one of the most complex, mysterious and vital human resources: the human brain. Under OSTP's leadership, we will enter the next decade committed to unlocking the brain's secrets and discovering remedies to its disorders and diseases. The President recently submitted a budget amendment to increase the fiscal year 1990 request for OSTP. Additional funds would permit the President to aggressively pursue development and implementation of national science policy, including promotion of the life sciences. Unfortunately, that amendment was submitted too late for the Appropriations Committee to give it due consideration. I would, however, hope that as this bill moves along, we will ultimately be able to accommodate the administration's request.

H.R. 2916 provides needed resources for the protection of our environment and the provision of emergency assistance. It also provides for full funding of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, an accomplishment we can all be proud of.

Further, it provides funds to protect consumers, advance the sciences, promote community development, and preserve our national heritage.

This bill also continues to honor the Federal Government's commitment to help clean up Boston Harbor. The bill provides \$20 million for this effort in fiscal year 1990 and keeps Congress on

track to fully fund the Federal Government's \$100 million contribution to this project by 1992.

The bill as a whole is carefully balanced to promote the general welfare and maximize the value of our limited financial resources. Accordingly, I strongly support H.R. 2916 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1150

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, let me extend my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] for his kind words. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am proud of this day, and of our friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER]. Not only is he going to be, but he is now one of our outstanding subcommittee chairmen. I take this time not only to congratulate him and various members of the subcommittee, but all those who have attempted to work out this situation here.

May I say the Committee on Appropriations has a wonderful record of holding down expenditures. Since 1945 we have been \$187 billion below the total recommended by Presidents. Under President Reagan we were \$16 billion below the amounts that he recommended.

May I say further that I was one of those that recommended the Committee on the Budget, for the purpose of helping the Committee on Appropriations to hold down expenditures, and to help Members to hold down entitlement bills as well as binding contracts which have caused our real trouble.

There are two or three things which are bound to be recognized here. One of them is that the technology and inventions that grow out of our science programs are not developed in the United States frequently, because of the Gramm-Rudman bill, and we are not able to cash in on them. However, we do end up buying from other countries who are taking and putting in production things we have discovered over here. Another result of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act, CBO comes in with estimates about what will happen and then anytime during the year or at the end of the year, comes up with another last-minute estimate about outlays, which means we are on a teeter pole all year.

I shall not, at this time, go into the various things in this bill which our chairman [Mr. TRAXLER] has done, and which the ranking member from New York [Mr. GREEN] has done, and others on the floor, but I will extend my remarks and point out some of the great things we have done here. Again, my I say this is a changing world, and much of the money in this bill is for the purpose of keeping up with scien-

tific developments. They all cost money, and sooner or later we will have to recognize that our President, who is a fine person, recommends many things, but he does not recommends funds with which to pay for them.

I think the subcommittee and all the members—and I am a member of the subcommittee, and proud of it—have done a good job in trying to balance these things. Along the line we will have to have freedom in the committee on Appropriations to look at this as they have done for years, and may I say until this time, the budget Committee process has not saved any money, it has not operated as well, and Congress at the present time is tied down by restrictions that are unnecessary and unworkable, because they have failed to carry out the intent of the Congress in providing the Budget Act.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the various veterans programs, which we have always supported, including the recent supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 2402.

Truly this bill is of national interest, for it covers activities in every district of the Nation.

Included are funds for housing for the elderly and handicapped and other housing programs, community development grants, emergency shelter grants, supplemental assistance for the homeless, hazardous substance superfund, wastewater construction grants, disaster relief, emergency food and shelter program, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation.

I am glad to say that the bill contains \$121 million for the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program which is at Yellow Creek in my district, a facility which will contribute greatly to the scientific period in which we live. I point out too, that we have an agreement to authorize the contingent liability provision for the contractors, which will speed up this project.

Again, it has been a pleasure as a member of this subcommittee to have first hand knowledge of the great job BOB TRAXLER has done with the support of BILL GREEN and the other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend and congratulate my dear friend from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the chairman of the subcommittee, for the outstanding job which he has done in preparing this legislation for the floor. I rise today in support of H.R. 2916 and for the purposes of entering into a colloquy with

my good friend and Michigan colleague, BOB TRAXLER, chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and independent agencies. My Michigan colleague, BILL FORD, and I thank subcommittee Chairman TRAXLER for including in the bill \$500,000 for a nonpoint source control demonstration for the Rouge River in southeast Michigan as part of a more comprehensive cleanup project.

Mr. TRAXLER, I would like to confirm that it is the intent of the committee that these moneys are provided for the element one portion of a four-part project targeting basins identified within the Rouge River remedial action plan. Element one works toward cleaning basins with separate sanitary and storm sewer facilities that have been identified as areas of contamination. Element one of the demonstration project identifies those pipes that contribute substantial pollutant loading into the stormwater collection system.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. My good friend and colleague is correct in stating that the funds are provided for a nonpoint portion of a project developed by the Wayne County Department of Public Services, Division of Public Works. The project has the support of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The overall project proposes a three-prong approach on solving the pollution problems associated with combined sewer overflows and nonpoint source discharges. These moneys are intended to assist with implementation of the nonpoint pollution demonstration control portion of the project.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the remainder of the proposed project not yet funded by this bill includes elements two through four addressing problems with combined sewer overflows, development of a primary treatment facility, and engineering and computer integration of the entire system.

In addition, I commend my good friend for the inclusion of \$51.8 million for the Nationwide Program for Nonpoint Source Planning and Implementation Programs. I believe this Nationwide Program will be instrumental in assisting communities to address serious environmental problems with nonpoint sources of pollution.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my friend for his outstanding work.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished former ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in commending the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, my friend, the new chairman of the subcommittee on his maiden voyage for a job well done. The gentleman, [Mr. TRAXLER], is a fine chairman, a knowledgeable chairman, and a fair chairman. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], whose knowledge of our housing programs is surpassed by no one in this Congress, and indeed, by no one in this country. Let me also commend the staff, the Committee on Appropriations has one of the finest staffs, imaginable, and this subcommittee has a staff with no peer.

Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has the unbelievable task of balancing many competing interests from housing to the environment, veterans' health care, to space science, and selective service. Striking a balance within the existing budgetary limitations is certainly a herculean task. We have in this bill provided for America's poorest tenants, and have forced reexamination of those HUD programs that have been tainted by scandal.

□ 1200

We have maintained our commitment to the space station and have provided the funding to maintain our lead in science. We have provided for America's veterans, and I might say that we have been assured in the subcommittee that the funding provided in this bill will be adequate to provide for the veterans without the situation we faced last year when we had to pass a supplemental appropriation.

We have continued our quest for a cleaner atmosphere and a better environment for our citizens and for the minimization of waste. In my own backyard, we have continued support of the people of Philadelphia who are facing the loss of their homes due to a serious ground subsidence problem.

This is a good bill, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that all of our Members will support it. I may have an amendment during the course of the consideration of the bill to delay the construction of the National Science Foundation's research vessel so that a potential duplication with the Coast Guard can be worked out. This delay has also been proposed in the budget of the Coast Guard.

Needless to say, the funding levels in this bill will not satisfy everyone. We all have our own interests and our own desires, but I think that this bill meets all of our commitments in an equitable manner. It clearly deserves the support of the Members of the House, and I urge its support.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my dear friend, a highly respected Member of this body and chairman of the authorizing commit-

tee, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriations measure.

As it relates to veterans programs, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs appreciates the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], and the very able ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], the ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

I thank all of them for helping move forward what I think is a fair veterans appropriation bill.

I especially want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] for keeping me totally informed through many phone calls of what was taking place as far as veterans' programs were concerned. This is really the first time this has happened to me in dealing with appropriation matters, and I want to make a public record of my thanks to him for his total willingness to work with our committee.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the authorizing committee, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. His good assistance and guidance has made possible what we have been able to do in the area of veterans. For that, the veterans of America are grateful, and so am I. I thank the gentleman for his help.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those kind words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the allocation to the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies was about \$700 million below the President's budget. When the subcommittee has to start out \$700 million in the hole, and recognizing that approximately \$725 million in outlays must be added to maintain a proper level of funding for veterans' health care, it is really starting out about \$1.4 billion short, assuming the full funding for the President's request. This did create a major problem for the subcommittee.

The bill treats veterans very fairly, given the budget situation we face today. I am generally pleased with the overall numbers in this bill. The veterans' health care system may be able to operate, Mr. Chairman, without further reductions in services during the next fiscal year should we adopt this bill. It contains \$820 million more

than the President's request for medical care.

Based on our committee's investigations, we believe the amount should be a little more than \$1 billion, but it is not possible to appropriate the full amount this year, and we realize that. If we adopt this bill, it may be possible to survive another year without a supplemental. It all depends on what happens in the other body, and this is certainly important. It is important that the Senate meet the amount contained in this bill for medical care, and I really call on the veterans' service organizations to do the work that needs to be done on the Senate side. What I am saying is that if the Senate comes in and reduces medical care for veterans and gives it to other departments and agencies, the Department of Veterans Affairs will be unable to take care of the health care needs of veterans.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains \$30 million for homeless veterans. The bill would restore 8,526 personnel in the VA hospital system that would have been reduced by the administration's proposed budget. We have a critical shortage of nurses, and the bill would provide \$8.7 million for the Nurse Scholarship Program.

The bill contains \$13.6 million more than the President requested for medical and prosthetic research and \$1.5 million more for general operating expenses.

The bill contains \$418 million for major construction. Some of this would be for new outpatient clinics and other needed facilities. This is about \$52 million more than requested by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has done its work for veterans. I again want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], and other members of the subcommittee and the full committee for the high priority they have given to veterans. I would certainly hope that we can get a fair shake over in the other body, and if we do that, I believe the medical care for veterans will be completely covered by this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has done a very good job under difficult circumstances, and for that I think we are to be grateful to the leadership, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER]. I would also like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the ranking member of the Committee on

Appropriations, as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], the ranking member of the subcommittee, for all of their hard work.

Mr. Chairman, I support the funding level for the Department of Veterans Affairs because it is a significant step toward addressing shortfalls being experienced by the VA health care system. However, I do not believe it is enough to maintain the current decreased level of services much less return to the service levels provided veterans prior to our supplemental funding battle of this year.

Mr. Chairman, the VA health care system may well be worse off next year than it is next year. I hope not, but we had better be prepared for another bout over emergency supplemental appropriations next year.

Mr. Chairman, let us clearly understand what \$11.56 billion will and will not do for veterans' health care.

In my opinion, it will not support a VA health-care staffing level of 194,720, as the committee report states. It will not even support the current inadequate staffing level of about 190,000.

Discretionary health care for categories B and C veterans may be permanently eliminated.

New equipment purchase accounts, and repair and maintenance accounts will probably be stripped to fund day-to-day operations.

VA facilities may be forced to curtail the types of health-care services available for veterans who are entitled to care.

Activations of newly constructed facilities may be delayed further.

The VA will increasingly become viewed as an unattractive and noncompetitive employer because of funding inadequacies and uncertainties.

It will be increasingly difficult for the Department to recruit and retain the health care professionals necessary to provide quality health care for veterans.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to a good friend and a very valuable member of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AuCOIN].

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding time to me, and I take this time to engage my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee and the manager of this bill, in a brief colloquy. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan this question:

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is aware of a recent final decision by the ninth circuit court of appeals which rejected the Department of Housing and Urban Development's policy of employing a separate comparability analysis to limit annual rent adjustments as part of the Section 8 Rental Assistance Payments Program.

What is the gentleman's understanding of any steps HUD is taking to comply with this decision?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is the committee's understanding that HUD is currently in the process of calculating precise retroactive payments owed to participants in this program in the 10 States affected by the ninth circuit's decision. HUD expects final determinations of need to be made by its field offices by August 1, 1989.

Mr. AuCOIN. Is it the committee's intent that HUD should make such retroactive payments on an expedited basis?

Mr. TRAXLER. Indeed it is. We are in complete agreement that HUD should promptly comply with the law in this regard, and we believe sufficient funds have been appropriated for HUD to make required payments.

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his responses.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKE-MAL].

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for yielding me this time. As the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, I take a particular interest in this appropriations bill.

At the outset, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] for this bill, which is his first as chairman of the subcommittee. He and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] have done an admirable job under what are always difficult circumstances. There is never as much money as we would like, and the committee always has a demanding task in its distribution.

I would like to highlight a couple of the committee's actions in particular.

First, the bill provides for a mix of vouchers and 5-year section 8 certificates. This is a prudent approach and one which many of us have advocated over the years. Vouchers work well in certain areas and not as well in others, so a reasonable mix makes good sense.

Second, the committee recognized the problem we face with expiring section 8 contracts and has recommended \$1.092 billion for contract renewals. As I have said on this floor before, the expiration of such contracts is only one of several growing and expensive housing problems we face in the years immediately ahead of us. Other problems, like prepayment and cleaning up lead paint, will also demand more and more resources.

I am disturbed that the committee has chosen to increase the number of units of public housing new construc-

tion. At over \$70,000 per unit, such public housing is very expensive. We could provide more housing for more low-income people if we would use that new construction money for other types of housing assistance. For example, my preference would have been to direct more resources to modernization which is more cost-effective than new construction. As the committee report indicates, PHA's could easily use \$1 billion more for modernization beyond that which is already provided in the bill. It simply makes no sense to build additional units when we cannot even afford to properly maintain the units we already have.

Later today, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] will offer an amendment which I will support which would take only the increase—\$176 million—for new construction and provide it to section 8 certificates, resident management technical assistance, and a public housing drug initiative. I will have more to say on this subject when the gentleman offers his amendment.

The Appropriations Committee shares the same concerns my own Housing Subcommittee has over the scandals which have plagued the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In response, the committee has provided no funds in its bill for the section 8 Modernization Rehabilitation Program. This leaves the option for future funding after evaluation of the systemic problems in the program. This action by itself does not greatly trouble me for the following reason. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] and I have introduced H.R. 1637, the Affordable Housing Act. One of its provisions would create a new Housing Opportunities Partnership Program, known as the HOP Program. This would be a block grant style of housing assistance which would allow rental assistance, rehabilitation or construction. It would maximize local control over such decisions, which I think is good because what is needed in one area of the country is not necessarily what is needed in another. Senators CRANSTON and D'AMATO are pushing this proposal in the Senate, and I hope the Housing Subcommittee of the House will consider new housing legislation in the near future. So, while I think the Modernization Rehabilitation Program has produced much good housing, despite the abuses in the program, its benefits should be evaluated relative to other innovative targeted programs.

The bill also prohibits the use of consultants for any projects which may receive units from remaining 1988 or 1989 funds. I have two concerns with this action.

First, this is clearly a matter within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Develop-

ment. Our subcommittee is looking at several different legislative proposals in reaction to the scandal. It is not helpful to include this kind of legislation in an appropriations bill.

Second, outright prohibition of consultants, whether in an authorization bill or an appropriation bill, may be a degree of overkill. Housing consultants, per se, are not necessarily bad. Many PHA's which need technical assistance will be at a serious disadvantage with this prohibition. The problem is influence peddling by unqualified politically connected consultants. In contrast, qualified, knowledgeable consultants can provide an important and necessary service. I am afraid the committee took the sledge-hammer approach on this one.

Finally, the bill again engages in legislation by requiring that all Deputy Assistant Secretaries at HUD be reclassified as career positions instead of political appointments. In conversations I have had with members of the Appropriations Committee, I objected to the usurpation of the jurisdiction of the Banking Committee.

I am grateful that our discussions have been serious and productive. I understand that a member of the committee will offer a technical amendment which will satisfy my jurisdictional and substantive concerns.

My last comment is that I am pleased that the committee has recommended full funding of the McKinney homeless programs, which President Bush called for last fall. I have been a strong supporter of these programs and was a cosponsor of the original McKinney legislation and its reauthorization last year.

As Members also know, I have called for certain reforms, specifically in addressing the needs of the mentally ill homeless. I think that combining the various McKinney programs into one homeless block grant would be much more effective. Such a proposal offered last year by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE] and myself failed by only a handful of votes on the floor. I hope this is a matter which we can revisit when the Housing Subcommittee next considers the McKinney Act. In short, while I support full funding, I also hope we may achieve some program reforms in the near future.

□ 1210

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] in order to join her in a colloquy.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the chairman of the committee, for his fantastic leadership on this measure, and the ranking member as well, and Mr. Chairman, the report accompanying H.R. 2916 di-

rects EPA to study eutrophication control programs in the Maumee River and Bay and survey existing research on the western basin of Lake Erie. Is the chairman aware of the University of Toledo's experience in conducting such water quality studies?

Mr. TRAXLER. Let me assure the gentlewoman from Ohio, that in including this directive to EPA. The committee was fully aware of the special qualifications of the University of Toledo and its staff. They have done extensive work in developing baseline data in these waterways and offer a very cost-effective resource to EPA. And I would urge the Environmental Protection Agency to take advantage of their experience.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], and I do want to say that we are so pleased that the western basin of Lake Erie will no longer be neglected, being the shallowest area on the Great Lakes and subject to so many environmental hazards and concerns, and I also want to commend the gentleman for the leadership in the area of veterans and bringing to this House a bill which at least attempts to meet some of the needs of our veterans especially in health care and in housing which has been a long and difficult struggle with this administration and the previous one. So, I want to commend him for his efforts on the entire bill.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, no doubt the Members of the House are by now aware of the controversy which arose last week over the belated discovery of a provision in the recent supplemental appropriations bill which threatened a terrible disservice to the hundreds of thousands of Americans living in federally subsidized public housing. I want to commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Subcommittee for the foresight they exercised by including countervailing provisions in the legislation before the House today.

In an effort to rid the public housing system of drug dealers and drug abusers, and make it safer for the people living there, HUD began streamlining its eviction procedures earlier this year. Secretary Kemp directed that in cases where State laws were in place to protect the due-process rights of tenants against whom eviction proceedings had been initiated, HUD would exercise its authority to waive a pretrial administrative hearing and proceed directly into court. Secretary Kemp has estimated that the waiver of this duplicative phase of the eviction process would save as much as a year's delay in getting drug dealers out of public housing. A lot of young lives can be lost to drugs in a year.

The provision in the supplemental—well intentioned though it may have been—would have substantially undermined the Secretary's "waiver policy." The protections the provision seeks to provide to innocent members of a household threatened with eviction as a result of the drug-related activities of other household members are already in place. I am confident that if this was not so the public housing administrators in my State would not support the actions which my colleagues have taken in this bill. To the contrary, all of those I have heard from indicated support for these efforts.

The energy and enthusiasm which Secretary Kemp has brought to his new job speaks clearly of his commitment to improving the lives of the men and women and children who call public housing home. The Secretary, no less than those he serves most directly, deserves a chance and he deserves our support. I congratulate my colleagues on their effort to ensure that he gets that chance.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY].

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and commend the chairman and ranking member for bringing this bill to floor. I also rise to enter into a brief colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee has demonstrated foresight and serious commitment toward addressing the environmental devastation caused by decades of raw sewage flowing from Mexico into the United States. Currently, a long-term solution is under consideration; specifically, the construction of a joint international treatment facility at the border—an approach somewhat different from that envisioned in last year's report. Would you clarify whether the \$20 million provided last year and the \$7 million included in this measure could be used for alternate projects such as the construction of a joint facility?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], who has taken a lead role in this matter, that we are very proud and grateful for his assistance in this matter. We want to assure him that the committee is supportive of any technical approach to the Tijuana sewage problem around which a consensus can form. Both the 1989 and 1990 appropriations are intended to be available for activities authorized by section 510, including participation in a joint facility if that approach is cost effective.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] for clarifying that language.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] for his inquiry and his support.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for yielding me this time, and, Mr. Speaker, I will not take much time. I just want to again thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for the outstanding job they have done on title I.

Mr. Chairman, we have had such a terrible problem in funding the VA medical facilities over the last several years, and I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] that there was a shortfall of over three-quarters of a billion dollars which is really coming home to roost. The fact that we were able to take care of most of that shortfall in the recently passed supplemental, and with the outstanding job that has been done on this particular bill before us now, will go a long way toward correcting many of the problems that we have in the VA medical facilities, especially with the geriatrics problem. The average age of the World War II veteran today is about 69 years of age. Problems continue to grow, and, if we underfund these facilities, we are just going to be doing a terrible injustice to these American citizens.

So, Mr. Chairman, I again say to these gentlemen that I know their job is only half finished here. When they get to the conference I know their work is going to be doubly hard because the Senate bill does not carry the level of funding in medical care facilities that this bill does here. I would just hope that we stick to our guns and refuse to yield to the Senate. Let's keep this level of funding even if we have to come back in disagreement and fight another day.

So, again I take my hat off to both of these gentlemen for an outstanding job.

□ 1220

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS], a long-time Member and a most valuable member of the subcommittee and of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the chairman and the ranking member and all the members of the committee and all the members of the staff for coming to the floor with a reasonable bill under very, very difficult circumstances.

There is one aspect of the bill that has not been complimented that I would like now to commend, and that is that we put into the bill under these very difficult circumstances \$20 million more for the appropriation of teachers for precollege activities in science and mathematics and for the enhancement of some of the tools that are necessary in order for these teachers to be able to spread the kind of information and to devise the kinds of programs and the curricula that will be necessary to prepare the young children of this Nation to take up the kinds of jobs and opportunities upon which our Nation will depend in the 21st century.

We have learned that statistical evidence is very strong that by the year 2000 the average time of training for an ordinary job in the kind of economy that will be extant at the time is 13.2 years of training, so that we must go forward with the kind of preparation that will be needed into the elementary schools, into the middle schools, and into the high schools, so that the young people of this Nation may be prepared to enter into all of the magnificent programs that the President pointed out this morning in his speech.

We cannot go to a manned space station. We cannot go to manned moon station and we cannot go to Mars without making certain that the young people of this country are properly educated and capable of taking us there.

So I commend the committee especially for this add-on that we are very grateful to receive.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS].

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2916, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies for fiscal year 1990.

While I have some reservations about the funds requested over and above what the President requested for HUD, I strongly believe that we are getting back on track in the Department of Housing and Urban Development with our former colleague, Jack Kemp, at the helm.

Secretary Kemp has taken the lead in trying to get to the bottom of the ongoing scandal at HUD. The hearings in the Government Operations Subcommittee on Employment and Housing, of which I am a member, are uncovering fundamental flaws in the management system and in personnel selection in this program which authorizes the Federal Government to

provide housing to low-income persons and to the elderly.

As we have heard in the committee hearings and read in the press, the problems with the mod rehab program have run rampant. I feel the committee has begun to address these problems with the change in status of the deputy assistant secretaries from political appointments to confirmed positions. This change, which is supported by Secretary Kemp, will hopefully prevent future abuse of the system.

I also support the veterans portion of this bill. I believe that Ed Derwinski, another former colleague of ours, will continue to do an outstanding job as Secretary of this new Department. I feel he has shown that he will truly stand up for the veterans of this country by refusing to appeal the recent court decision on agent orange, which I strongly agree with.

The veterans budget offered by my colleagues fully addresses the needs of this country's veterans. It provides \$15.4 billion for compensations and pensions and \$16.3 billion for the Veterans Benefits Administration. I strongly believe that these two accounts should continue to be fully funded to compensate those who were willing to defend our Nation's borders.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and resist any attempt to cut these needed programs. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER], a member of the committee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his generosity in yielding me all this time.

Mr. Chairman, about all I have time to say is that I once served as a member of this subcommittee, and it was with great pride that I participated in the space programs and the funding of NASA.

Mr. Chairman, last night I extended a well deserved "well done" to my friends Mike Collins, Neil Armstrong, and Buzz Aldrin. I vividly remember 20 years ago tonight when they successfully traveled to the Moon and landed.

I was in Williamsburg, VA, on July 20, 1969, at the late evening hour when Neil Armstrong first set foot on the Moon. Just before the hatch opened on the lunar vehicle I awakened my 1-year-old daughter, Alyse, so that she could see history in the making. She opened her eyes, gazed quizzically at the TV and went back to sleep. But, she was awake long enough to later learn about the significance of that important event. For our great Nation had achieved a new height in technological advancement—the age of technology had arrived. All Americans take pride in the space program.

Also Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to provide funding for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and a number of independent

agencies for the coming year. The chairman, Mr. TRAXLER, and members of the subcommittee have labored long and hard to formulate the best possible bill within the limits of the tight Federal budget situation which faces the Congress.

I would like to focus particularly on two portions of the bill and report.

#### HOUSING PROGRAMS

The report on this bill expresses the reaction of outrage and distress shared by many of us in the Congress over the scandals resulting from theft, fraud, influence peddling, and gross mismanagement in subsidized and non-subsidized housing programs administered by HUD.

The report on the bill affirms the commitment of the Committee on Appropriations to cooperate with the efforts of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to correct the problems which have given rise to this villainy.

I believe it is important to note that information thus far available on these infamous actions indicates that much of the potential mismanagement, fraud, and abuse is directly related to programs that are not associated with funds appropriated by the Congress.

At any time the crooked actions which have produced the scandals would be wicked. They are doubly evil in a period such as the present when the numbers of homeless individuals and families are growing in every part of the Nation and when the evidence indicates that the American dream of home ownership is slipping further and further out of the reach of low- and moderate-income families.

The housing problems facing persons living in Arkansas' First Congressional District are as difficult, and if not more difficult, than those in most other parts of this Nation. The per capita income is among the lowest in the Nation. The district suffers from severe, chronic economic distress.

Thousands of new jobs have been generated in the district in the last two decades. But, the number of new people entering the labor force has grown even faster. The portion of the population 65 years old and older is 16 percent, and rises to 27 percent in at least one county. The percent of the population surviving on incomes below the poverty level reaches 30 percent in some areas.

Despite the economic problems and the narrow profit margins involved, I am proud to say that the private home building industry in the district has been aggressively working to meet the housing needs challenge.

An affordable housing program was initiated by Crittenden County home builders. It has spread across the State. The program's success in responding to the homeownership needs of low-income families, has drawn national recognition.

Don Bulter, a State and national leader in home building and an originator of the affordable housing project in Crittenden County, is regularly asked to meet with home builders and other community leaders across the Nation to brief them on Arkansas' affordable housing miracle.

Last year I had the privilege of helping the people of Elaine, AR, dedicate their first federally assisted housing complex built to meet the needs of older and of handicapped Arkan-

sans. This was constructed through a private and public partnership effort. It is located in one of the most economically distressed counties in Arkansas and the Nation. The 21 units were constructed with assistance from a program administered by HUD. It cost an average of \$30,000 per unit to build the housing.

No one who works to help people like those of Elaine to supply their housing needs can doubt that the scoundrels who committed the greedy, dishonest deeds which spawned the HUD housing scandals have robbed low- and moderate-income families of a chance to find safe, sanitary, and decent housing.

It is cruelly ironic that information now coming to light indicates that former HUD officials raked in hundreds of thousands of dollars in profits by abusing the very housing program they and the previous Presidential administration tried to kill.

In crafting the housing portion of the bill before us, the subcommittee has recognized the diverse housing needs and conditions across the Nation. It has done its work with an understanding that a single solution will not be appropriate for all the problems or all regions. A variety of approaches to housing low- and moderate-income Americans would be supported through the funding in this bill.

Of particular importance in this bill is the direct loan program explicitly for the purpose of assisting qualified nonprofit sponsors to provide housing to meet the needs of senior citizens and handicapped persons.

The President proposed limiting the aggregate loan total in 1990 to \$32 million. The committee recommends a 1990 total of \$480.1 million which should provide for approximately 6,375 housing units under the regular program and 2,125 units for handicapped persons under the separate program authorized in 1987.

#### VETERANS PROGRAMS

This appropriations bill provides the funding for programs specifically benefiting U.S. military veterans, their families and survivors which are administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Thirty percent, 74.4 million persons, of the U.S. population are potential recipients of veterans benefits. This includes 27.3 million veterans, 45.4 million family members of living veterans, and 1.7 million survivors of deceased veterans.

More than 42,000 veterans live in Arkansas' First Congressional District which I have the honor of representing.

The bill before us today would provide \$29.5 billion to support veterans benefit programs. This is \$908.2 million more than the President requested.

Most of the additional Department of Veterans Affairs funding, \$820 million, is for the medical care programs to provide health benefits to veterans. The American military veteran population is aging. Their health care needs are increasing.

Leaders of Arkansas veterans organizations and individual veterans have reported growing problems with obtaining the health services to which they are entitled. At least one major factor appears to be that needs have outrun the supply which VA funding could provide.

I believe it is vitally important for the Nation to make good on its health care commitments

to these men and women who answered the Nation's call to arms in defense of the freedoms, liberty, and democracy enjoyed by all Americans. The proposed increase in medical care funding is vitally important.

If the President will not request sufficient funding for these programs, the Congress must lead the way. I do not believe that there is a single Member of this House who wants our Nation's veterans to experience a repeat of the anxiety and uncertainty of this spring because of the unwillingness of the Presidential administration to correctly assess the need for veterans health care funds.

Again, I support passage of this bill.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to commend the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies for recognizing the importance of the Construction Grants Program of the Clean Water Act. As you know, the President sought just half of the authorized amount, \$1.2 billion, for this vital program in its final year of operation. Under that proposal literally hundreds of clean water programs would have languished uncompleted. Or, local communities would have been severely burdened by the need to fund the construction necessary to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act.

Many of my colleagues joined together to send messages to the Budget and Appropriations Committees expressing the need to provide funds for the Construction Grant Program. We are grateful that the Appropriations Committee has provided \$2.024 billion for clean water.

The committee went even further by including new funding for another clean water program of great importance—nonpoint source pollution control. In providing \$52 million in set-asides for the abatement of nonpoint source pollution, we begin a new phase in cleaning up our waterways. Nonpoint source pollution is not easy to identify and more difficult to control than the point source pollution addressed by the Construction Grants Program. This nonpoint source pollution set-aside is a good beginning to find ways to decrease the contaminants entering our waters.

The Construction Grants Program has been granted a reprieve this year, but the program will be completely phased out next year, replaced by State revolving loan funds which were mandated in the 1987 Clean Water Act amendments. The goals of the Clean Water Act of 1972 have not been met. We must continue to look for ways to assist localities, with funding and technology, to put an end to the damage done to our Nation's waters from pollution in the form of untreated or undertreated sewage. Many of the beaches along Long Island Sound have already been closed this summer because of high bacteria counts caused by untreated sewage polluting the water in which we swim and fish. Upgrading sewage treatment plants and expanding their capacity will help return Long Island Sound, and other bodies of water throughout the country, to healthy, safe waterways.

Without clean water and fresh air, all the technological advances, scientific discoveries, and defense initiatives in the world will be meaningless. The appropriations bill we will be voting on today takes a step in the right direction to acknowledge the importance of our Nation's water resources. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the clean water provisions of the EPA appropriation by voting in favor of this measure.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2916, the bill providing appropriations in fiscal year 1990 for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.

There are many diverse items in this bill and I know it was not easy for the subcommittee to allocate the funds for these various programs. Yet Mr. TRAXLER, the subcommittee chairman, and Mr. GREEN, the ranking minority member, did an excellent job of putting together a fair bill which helps to meet this Nation's needs. In his first effort as subcommittee chairman on a regular appropriations bill, Mr. TRAXLER should especially be commended for the fine job he has done on this bill. The subcommittee staff also deserves recognition for their efforts in this legislation. I know that many hours of hard work were put into the development of this measure.

First, I would like to thank the subcommittee for including \$500,000 in the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency for the Federal share of a \$2 million air quality modeling study for the Sacramento Valley.

The air quality modeling study, which is scheduled to begin the spring of 1990 and be completed in October 1992, will look at the entire Sacramento Air Quality Maintenance Area, which includes the Sacramento and Yuba City-Marysville urban areas as well as seven separate air basins within the larger Sacramento Valley air basin.

The study area runs north to south, from Yuba City-Marysville to just north of Rio Vista, and east to west from Placerville to the coastal range.

The study will examine the "Schultz Eddy," a meteorological event which recirculates emissions in the air basins, and the extent to which pollutants move between metropolitan Sacramento and the Yuba City-Marysville urban areas.

The study will also determine how pollutants move between the San Francisco Bay area and the Sacramento area and the degree to which areas in the Sierra Nevada Mountains near Lake Tahoe are affected by Sacramento Valley air pollution.

This Federal funding is crucial to ultimately producing a plan that will improve the air quality in Sacramento and the entire Sacramento Valley.

In 1988, Sacramento air quality was in violation of Federal and State standards 26 times, and Sacramento is ranked among the dozen metropolitan areas in the Nation with the worst air pollution.

Mr. Chairman, again, I greatly appreciate the cooperation and support of the subcommittee chairman and the ranking minority member on this effort.

The subcommittee also deserves commendation for its funding recommendations for various housing programs contained in the bill.

The measure provides \$11.8 billion for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including \$8.9 billion for housing assistance and \$1.8 billion for public housing operating subsidies. This total is \$2.1 billion more than the current funding level and \$2 billion more than the administration request. This Nation is facing serious problems with some of our housing programs, not only in terms of the management of these programs, but we also face a tremendous lack of affordable housing. This bill helps address these problems.

I also applaud the subcommittee for increasing funding by \$1.76 million over the current funding level for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. This invaluable agency, along with Neighborhood Housing Services, has been instrumental in providing revitalization assistance to neighborhoods throughout the country, including several in my congressional district.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on mentioning the fine job of the subcommittee in providing funding for veterans' programs, EPA, NASA, and the other programs contained in the bill. Instead, I will close by saying that the subcommittee should be commended for its excellent work in allocating limited resources to a wide array of essential programs. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the members of the House Appropriations Committee for their work to preserve funding for the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy.

The Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 foresaw a vision of Government and the fire service working together to advance their common goal of a fire-safe America. Fifteen years later, I have seen that vision eroded to the point that the fire service has to fight to maintain a level of funding far below that which Congress and the fire service alike had determined was needed. Faced with threats of zero funding, the fire service has found itself embracing a policy of containment, when what today's fire problem demands is a rollback to original funding levels.

The United States boasts one of the highest standards of living in the world, yet has the worst fire problem of any industrialized country. Ten billion dollars' worth of property damage and thousands of lives lost each year is not a sketch of an insoluble problem; it is evidence that, despite the fine work of many of my colleagues, we have yet to address the fire problem in a complete, comprehensive manner.

The programs which my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee preserved will remain critical components of the Federal fire focus. The Student Travel Stipend Program continues to be the fire service's lifeline to the National Fire Academy, a lifeline which, if cut, would have dramatically altered the landscape of fire service training programs nationwide.

In the current fiscal climate, it is especially significant that the Appropriations Committee would not agree to the steady attrition of programs which have served as the linchpin of the Federal fire focus since 1974. I urge my colleagues to support the Appropriation Committee's budget for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2916 serves many important national needs. However, it comes to us with even more important flaws.

We do need services to veterans, especially health care. We need a space program and a housing program. But we don't need a bill creating 7½ percent more spending than last year. And we don't need a bill which flouts our budget constraints by pushing expenditures back into fiscal year 1989 or forward into fiscal year 1991.

The subcommittee was given an impossible task, or at least it was given insufficient 302(b) spending authority to fund all the needs that it saw, or that the rest of the Congress had already supported. The large gap between what the subcommittee wanted to spend and the spending authority it had was funded in a way that affronts our budget process. Shifting pay days and delaying outlays simply adds to the national debt and avoids the meager controls of our budget system.

This bill is a perfect example of why the deficit is growing so fast. Members want to fund programs more than they want to reduce deficits. Today the House is heroic in its spending. In a few weeks, many of the heroes will don a different uniform and vote against a debt-ceiling extension. Today the note is to spend big. After the spending bills are safely passed, the vote will be for frugality, as long as it's too late for the frugality to stop the spending.

The place to stop spending is here. The time is now. H.R. 2916 funds attractive programs but it is just too expensive. For that reason, I shall vote no.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 2916 and in support of the bill. I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee, for all of their hard work in trying to meet the diverse needs of the important programs under their jurisdiction.

I would especially like to express my support of the full funding of the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act programs that fall within this appropriations bill. From the VA medical assistance for the homeless to HUD's emergency shelter grants to the transitional housing demonstrations, it is indeed heartwarming to see our promises to assist the homeless begin to be fulfilled with this \$456 million.

Of course, the tragedy of homelessness is in many ways a direct result of the severe cutbacks in Federal housing assistance. If we sometimes sound like a broken record with regards to the over 70-percent cut since 1980, perhaps that is because for so long, no one seemed to have heard us. It does appear that this year, we are headed in the right direction by starting to redirect essential money to housing. The bill provides \$11.8 billion for the various housing programs, some 21 percent more than fiscal year 1989 appropriations.

I am somewhat concerned with the zero-funding of the section 8 moderate rehabilitation program. Although I cannot condone what has occurred with the program at HUD, nor do I believe that the paying of exorbitant consultant fees or other nongermane costs is the most effective way to provide our citizens with affordable housing. However, I would hope

that we don't get caught in the syndrome of throwing out the baby with the bath water. We cannot start indiscriminately ending all programs that have been abused without determining the ramifications that may have on the people they are supposed to serve. I would remind my colleagues that despite the defense procurement scandals, we didn't shut down DOD. Let's not shut down HUD.

Mr. Chairman, I am supportive of so many of the veterans, environmental, housing programs that I will not belabor the point. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 1990 Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies appropriations bill, H.R. 2916. As the ranking majority member on the subcommittee responsible for this bill, let me say that Chairman BOB TRAXLER and the ranking minority member, BILL GREEN, have done an outstanding job in leading efforts to fund those many programs which are essential to maintaining and enhancing the quality of life which distinguishes our Nation from all others.

With current budget constraints being what they are, funding the many programs covered under this bill has resembled a fiscal nightmare. There is, as Chairman TRAXLER has often said, "no money." Despite this reality, I am proud to say that I believe the subcommittee did a remarkable job in providing enough funds to keep many environmental, housing, veterans, science, and space programs alive.

This bill would appropriate \$65.1 billion in new budget authority for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and 18 independent agencies. Specifically, the bill provides approximately \$29 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs; \$15.2 billion for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; \$12.3 billion for NASA; almost \$2 billion for the National Science Foundation; and \$5.4 billion for the Environmental Protection Agency.

Most of us here today would like to see more money appropriated for these programs. I think we are all fed up with having to borrow from Peter to pay Paul. Every day my constituents report to me their frustrations and their need for additional Federal assistance. There are thousands of veterans in my district in need of improved medical care. Hundreds of people throughout the State of Ohio have contacted my office to seek additional funding for the EPA sewer construction project. The NASA Lewis Research Center employs many of my constituents. The subcommittee's failure to fund the advanced communications technology satellite may directly affect many of their jobs. I also have some of the oldest housing in my congressional district, Mr. Chairman. Modernization moneys are desperately needed. I am pleased that the committee has provided \$2 billion for this program in fiscal year 1990, but with \$20 billion in modernization needs across the Nation, the more difficult task of providing decent housing to public housing tenants clearly await us.

Mr. Chairman the problems plaguing our cities and paralyzing the poor can only be put on hold for so long. Action must be taken to end this fiscal tug-of-war.

Passage of H.R. 2916 is a crucial and necessary first step. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, passage of the bill we consider today is not a panacea. In order for us to effectively address the many housing, environmental, veterans, technological challenges we currently face, we must have the assistance of the administration. It is no secret, Mr. Chairman, our Nation has a huge budget deficit. For fiscal year 1989 we have about \$160 billion worth of debt. The solution is obvious, we must increase revenue, or face irreparable damage from the deep budget cuts we have been forced to inflict year after year.

I ask my colleagues to join me in passing this bill today.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the funding for veterans' programs contained within H.R. 2916, the VA-HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill, represents a vast improvement over the disastrous vets' budget proposal submitted to this House earlier this year by President Bush, and I commend the Appropriations Committee members and especially Chairman WHITTEN for his diligent efforts to treat American veterans with the respect they deserve.

The bill we are acting on today appropriates \$11.6 billion for medical care and treatment of eligible beneficiaries, and that represents a \$679 million, 6 percent, increase over last year's funding level. The committee has wisely rejected the Bush administration's proposals to drastically decrease total staffing for VA hospitals despite a rapidly growing demand for VA health care as a result of an increasing number of aging veterans.

Nonetheless, despite significant improvements over the administration's initial budget proposal, I believe that VA funding is still inadequate. I do not believe that any category of veteran should be denied the health care that has been promised to him, on either an outpatient or in-patient basis. While the increased funding in this bill will allow the VA to treat more patients, I remain very doubtful that it will be enough to meet what I regard as a fundamental commitment of our Government—that is to meet the health care needs of every veteran regardless of category.

H.R. 2916 contains \$15.4 billion for veterans' service connected compensation payments and pensions, but it does not provide adequate funds for a needed cost-of-living-adjustment [COLA] a COLA of at least 3.6 percent is appropriate this year, and the cost of that adjustment—\$318 million—ought to have been included in this legislation. Mr. Chairman, if we are unable to add a vets' COLA to this bill, I will do all in my power to support a supplemental appropriation to the budget to provide for a fiscal year 1990 pension cost-of-living increase.

I am also concerned about the \$434 million appropriation for education, training, and rehabilitation programs for post-Korean war vets, and for educational assistance to the dependents of certain veterans. This represents a 30-percent cut—\$186 million—in funding over last year, and while a projected decrease in the number of veterans utilizing these programs may occur, I believe the cut far exceeds what is justifiable.

Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest challenges we have facing us in this country, is to

arrive at sensible and appropriate budget priorities. We all recognize that the Government must restrain its spending and that reduction of the Federal deficit is essential for the future health of our Nation. I am pleased that the administration's original proposal to gut VA spending, while requesting a massive \$3.5 billion increase in foreign aid has been rejected by the Appropriations Committee. But our spending priorities are still not what they should be. The needs of our veterans—the very people who have made it possible for us to openly and freely debate this issue on the floor of the House today—should be among the very first of our concerns. Given the very limited financial resources we have, it continues to make absolutely no sense to me that this Government spends tens of billions of dollars to subsidize our allies' defense, on foreign aid, and on space programs when we have not fully and adequately taken care of what should be regarded as sacred commitments to our vets. Our vets are not asking for extravagance; they have sacrificed for America and will continue to do so. But we, as Representatives of all Americans, have a special obligation to uphold the commitments made to our vets, and to at all times remember the high priority their basic needs should play in the course of our budget deliberations. This legislation is an improvement over other alternatives proposed by the administration, but I am hopeful that before the budget is finalized, that we will be able to come together in the House and the Senate, as Republicans and Democrats, to do still better for American veterans.

I am supportive of Representative SCHUMER's (D-NY) amendment to this legislation which would add an additional \$240 million for veterans' medical services, as well as assisting some other programs for the elderly and for schools, by deleting funds from the NASA appropriation for the proposed space station. Space station funding would continue to have a very healthy 4 percent increase in funding over last year, so I regard this to be a very moderate but helpful change in the original legislation.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies. Consistently, the task of dividing up a shrinking pie between our veterans, first-time home buyers, homeless, space scientists, and environmental professionals is the most difficult on the Appropriations Committee. This year, the subcommittee has done an excellent job.

The subcommittee has taken steps to insure that our veterans receive quality medical care for the entire fiscal year. The veterans who depend on that care can have peace of mind knowing that Congress took care of funding before the fiscal year, rather than resorting to another supplemental appropriations halfway through it. At least, we can agree that holding veterans health care hostage to our other disagreements will not be tolerated.

The subcommittee has also been able to fully fund the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act programs that fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Veterans Affairs. This includes \$30 million for homeless

veterans, tripling the funding for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program to \$125 million, and significant increases for the Transitional and Supportive Housing and Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless Programs. This bill also contains \$134 million for the Emergency Food and Shelter Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Total direct assistance for the homeless in this bill alone amounts to \$456.2 million, an increase of \$100 million over last year for all Federal homeless programs. In addition, the overall funding level for HUD jumps \$2.3 billion over last year. Furthermore, we should keep in mind that additional funding for homeless assistance will be included in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill which will be on the floor in a few days.

The McKinney Act has made a difference in helping communities cope with the rising rate of homelessness. However, it was always intended as a stopgap effort to get the homeless off of the street and into shelters. The funding in this bill reflects that priority. Now, however, the time has come to reorder those priorities and redirect McKinney funds to give communities assistance in treating and preventing homelessness. We should shift the emphasis from shelter programs to health, mental illness treatment, skills training, and permanent housing for families.

I look forward to addressing these needs with my colleagues when we begin consideration of the McKinney reauthorization. There are many innovative ideas being used in various communities that should be explored and nurtured. In the meantime, we can help those currently in the streets by approving this appropriations package.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2916, the 1990 appropriations bill for the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and several important independent agencies.

Included in the bill is funding for the clinical improvements and patient privacy project at the Nashville VA Medical Center and I would like to thank Chairman BOB TRAXLER, ranking Republican BILL GREEN and the other members of the subcommittee for recommending these funds in the bill.

This clinical addition is VA medical district 11's No. 1 priority and the No. 1 priority of veterans living in Nashville and middle Tennessee. Unfunded last year because completion of the architectural and construction drawings was delayed, the Appropriations Subcommittee nonetheless shared my view that the project should be funded at the earliest possible date once the drawings were ready. And I am pleased that that time has now arrived.

At present, the Nashville VA Medical Center serves about 300,000 veterans in middle Tennessee. Nearly 100,000 outpatient visits are recorded at the center each year.

The clinical improvements and patient privacy project includes construction of a 150,000-square-foot four-story addition on the front of the medical center, and the renovation of approximately 100,000 square feet of existing medical center space. The new construction will house new operating rooms, dental clinics,

medical and coronary intensive care units, a 40-bed intermediate care ward, a rehabilitation medical service, and additional mental health space.

The existing portions of the facility to be renovated include radiology, supply, processing and distribution, additional ambulatory care space, which will finally bring that entire function to the first floor and, finally, all 16-bed wards will be converted into three four-bed rooms for patient privacy.

This improvement project is long overdue and I thank the committee for finally bringing its construction to fruition.

I would also like to comment briefly on the Public Housing Home Ownership Demonstration Program.

Last week in Nashville, I had the honor of participating with Secretary Kemp, mayor and former Congressman Bill Boner, and the residents of the new edition Community Apartments Housing Cooperative in a ceremony whereby HUD transferred ownership of 85 units.

I would like to congratulate the residents of the new edition co-op and commend the officials of the Nashville Development and Housing Agency. Once again, our community is among the Nation's leaders in finding innovative solutions to the housing needs of our citizens.

At the same time, however, I want to emphasize my belief that we must continue to replace those public housing units which are taken off the market whether under the Home Ownership Demonstration Program or any other program. In that regard, I want to commend the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee for continuing the fight for new housing units.

Against the housing philosophy of this and the previous administration, the committee has worked to assure an adequate supply of low- and moderate-income housing. And given the constraints imposed by the Government's current fiscal problems, they have done a yeoman's job.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2916.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from New York, Mr. SCHUMER's amendment to the VA-HUD appropriations bill, H.R. 2916. I am for space exploration, but I think that before we continue to spend huge sums of money on programs such as the space station, we must establish concrete goals for a national space program. There have been some recent editorials on this theme in both the Wall Street Journal and one of my district's newspapers, the Oakland Tribune. I would like to include in the RECORD, the editorial that appeared in the Oakland Tribune:

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 18, 1989]

#### WHAT NASA NEEDS

Twenty years after America made history by landing men on the moon, its space program is drifting as aimlessly as an untethered astronaut. It has been buffeted by political whims, budgetary shifts and changing administrations.

Above all, it has suffered from lack of clear purpose. All too often, NASA has set its sights—and its budgets—on huge hardware projects like the space shuttle and now the space station rather than missions of great scientific or human importance.

As Walter McDougall, a University of Pennsylvania historian of space flight, commented last year, "I'm extremely disappointed that we've not used the opportunity that Challenger gave us to rethink the whole program, set new goals and revitalize the civilian space program. I don't see that that has happened."

Unclear as to its goals, the space agency has swallowed up tens of billions of dollars with little to show. NASA expended inordinate energy and money on the space shuttle. Yet it has proved a mind-bogglingly expensive way of putting payloads into orbit. It serves mainly to keep the space program manned and thus popular in Congress.

Now the space station threatens to repeat that failure by eating up more than three times its original cost estimate of \$8 billion—and for ends that NASA still hasn't clearly defined.

Some space enthusiasts have tried to fill the void by recommending a new era of manned missions, either to establish a permanent colony on the moon or to explore Mars. Both goals have scientific and emotional merit but would be prodigiously expensive to realize.

In the shorter run, America can revive its space program at low cost by concentrating on international, unmanned probes of the solar system and the broader universe—including planetary satellites, space telescopes and, above all, earth sensors.

NASA could start by taking up an offer made by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev last December to help fund space-based studies of the global environment, now threatened by the greenhouse effect and chemical attacks on the ozone layer.

The proposal was greeted enthusiastically by members of the American Geophysical Union, who for two years have been calling for a joint U.S.-Soviet project to launch satellites to monitor the earth's climate, atmosphere, pollution, ocean currents, deforestation and conditions of enormous importance to life in this small but unique part of the solar system. Former shuttle astronaut Sally Ride has a similar proposal for an unmanned "mission to planet Earth." International coordination in this field would eliminate wasteful duplication of separate national efforts.

A Soviet proposal for an international effort to orbit radio telescopes capable of seeing to the limits of the universe, also warrants America's participation. The project would satisfy humanity's hunger to know more about the origins of the universe and the mysteries of quasars, black holes, pulsars and colliding galaxies. Yet the Reagan administration refused to join Canada, West Germany and other nations in supporting it, thus possibly cutting off American scientists from the data it will gather.

Even sensible missions like these are only as good as the data analysis that follows them. Perhaps the most scandalous of NASA's failures has been to shortchange this vital but low-profile task.

As The Wall Street Journal reported last year, "the little-known secret is that scientists have looked at only 10 percent of the data that spacecraft have sent back to earth. They have closely analyzed only 1 percent of the mountain of tape." Indeed, the space agency hasn't even located or catalogued 60 percent of its data tapes.

Sending missions into space without studying the results makes as much sense as buying tanks without shells or spare parts. As America rethinks its goals in space, it

should start with a commitment to ending the mismatch between raw data and analysis. It should then pursue the rich possibilities of satellite-based exploration of the earth and the vast universe around us.

As the editorial points out, NASA has many worthwhile programs worth pursuing. The shuttle has produced little scientific yield whereas unmanned probes have yielded such a wealth of information that NASA has only analyzed 10 percent of it. Perhaps if NASA scientists weren't putting so much energy into building the space station, they might have a chance to look at some of this data.

Another point to consider before sinking tens of billions of dollars into the space station is this: Whatever happened to Skylab? NASA had a space station for almost 6 years, and what did they do with it? Skylab was launched in 1973, manned by three crews for less than a year, then floated around for 5 years until it fell to Earth in 1979. Will the same thing happen with the space station? I strongly urge support of the gentleman from New York's amendment to ensure that this doesn't happen. Until we figure out what it is that our space programs are supposed to accomplish, let's spend the money on useful programs with specific goals.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, years ago today, Americans were thrilled to see an American astronaut become the first human to walk on the Moon and to hear the first words spoken from the lunar surface. Our excitement came not only from the pride of mastering the enormous technical and physical challenges of landing a man on the Moon, but also from the realization of our national dream—the accomplishment of a difficult goal that we had set for ourselves. President Kennedy had called on America to reach beyond its horizons, and we met that challenge.

Similar pride of accomplishment was evident in our other space endeavors, from the first manned space shot in 1961, to our first orbital flight, through the first launch and return of our versatile and reusable craft—the space shuttle.

All of these accomplishments started out as a dream. Without having set goals for our Nation, we could not have begun to reach those milestones. In fact, one of the common criticisms of our space program over the last few years is that it doesn't embody any clear goals.

But I believe that the American people have goals for our space program, and one of those goals is embodied in the space station program—the dream of living and working in space. But the amendment now before us will snatch that dream away.

We know how to get to space and back, and how to deliver and retrieve items from space. But it is now time that we learn to live in space and to use that environment to conduct scientific research, manufacture new materials, and establish a way station for the manned exploration of our solar system. The

space station will allow us to achieve those goals.

Make no mistake—the Schumer amendment will not just delay the space station—it will kill it outright. Having already spent nearly \$2 billion on research and hardware development, the Government/industry teams are in place and entering the detailed design phase of the project. NASA contractors are ready to make the final push toward component construction and launch in 1995. In effect, the Schumer amendment says that all of this is for naught, and that we should demobilize our work teams and put our current accomplishments in mothballs.

In deference to budgetary realities, the space station budget request made by NASA has already been reduced by one-fourth. Americans understand and accept these limitations, but they also strongly support the goal of building this facility.

Americans know that our success through history has been spurred by our desire for discovery and by constantly pushing toward the next frontier. Our goals are now higher because our accomplishments have been so great.

We must not shrink from this challenge—to do so would cut against the grain of our national character. Americans dream of living and working in space, and our job is to help make that dream a reality. The Schumer amendment would kill that dream, and I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am in strong support of H.R. 2916, the fiscal year 1990 appropriations bill for VA, HUD, and independent agencies. Many of the programs funded in this \$65.1 billion measure are of great importance to my home State of West Virginia, and I would like to take this opportunity to highlight a few of them.

H.R. 2916 appropriates \$29.5 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs, including \$11.6 billion for veterans' medical care, which is \$679 million over the fiscal year 1989 funding level. These funds will allow VA hospitals to treat more patients, purchase much needed supplies and equipment, and provide for homeless programs for veterans as authorized by the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. This amount also provides \$164 million for an assumed 3.6 percent pay increase for VA medical personnel in 1990.

In addition, \$15.4 billion is appropriated for veterans' service-connected compensation payments and pensions. The measure also includes \$417.5 million for major construction projects and \$113.7 million for minor construction projects. It is up to the discretion of the VA as to how the money appropriated for the minor construction projects will be allocated. Veterans Affairs medical center hospitals such as the ones in Beckley and Huntington will be eligible to receive funds.

I strongly support the funding included in H.R. 2916 for this Nation's veterans. They have risked their lives and made immense

sacrifices for this great country of ours, and it is our obligation to see that their commitment is honored. To quote Theodore Roosevelt, "A man who is good enough to give his blood for his country, is good enough to be given a square deal afterward."

Also of great importance is the \$456.2 million contained in H.R. 2916 for HUD, VA, and FEMA programs to assist the homeless, which represents full funding for these programs as called for by the McKinney Act.

According to the West Virginia Task Force on Children at Risk, there are no hard statistics estimating the number of children who are living in substandard housing or who are homeless. Nationally, of course, estimates vary, but the numbers appear to approach 500,000 homeless children, with families with children being the largest growing sector of homeless people.

In fiscal year 1987, the year for which we have the most recent available data, 9,224 homeless individuals received services to meet basic needs in West Virginia, with 2,655 such individuals receiving shelter.

Yet another statistic, often overlooked when we think of homeless children, are those who are making the transition from the State foster care systems to the outside world, having reached the age of majority. Among the most critical needs of such youth, without family ties, is housing. It is difficult at best for this neglected segment of homeless children to find jobs, or the training for jobs and continuing education services, if they have no home base from which to operate. In West Virginia during fiscal year 1987, 132 such youths were transitioned from foster care homes, and required services to assist them in finding independent living programs to serve them.

And lest we forget, there are those children, under the age of accountability, who are runaways. National authorities report that only 1 in 12 youth who runs away receives shelter care. In West Virginia in 1987, 695 young people ran away from home. Shelter care was provided to 518 of those youth. These young people are, for the most part, homeless because they have been rejected by their parents who disclaim further responsibility for their welfare. While many of these young people in West Virginia are in foster care or awaiting foster care services, 72 of them were categorized as homeless.

The saddest statistic of all about homeless children is the rate of school failure among them. Homeless children go from school to school, if they go to school at all, and too many of them fall through the cracks despite valiant efforts on the part of West Virginia's Human Services Department and other agencies to find them and serve them. They are often ill-clothed and ill-fed—another disincentive to the learning process. Parents of homeless children are often so burdened with finding jobs, food, and some kind of temporary shelter week after week, that few if any of them are able to take an active role in their children's education. Yet I am confident they care as much as any parent.

Funds in this bill will go far toward alleviating the homelessness of children and their families in the United States. It won't solve all the problems, but combined with State and local efforts, administered by people who have the courage to care and to help fight to obtain any and all services to which the homeless are entitled, it can mean the difference, literally, between life and death for children and adults alike.

I applaud this effort by the Federal Government to provide, to the best of its ability during times of budgetary restraints and scarce resources, opportunities to alleviate, if not eliminate, homelessness in America. I know the States and local governments anxiously await this helping hand being held out to them today on the floor of the House of Representatives, sending a clear signal that they are not alone in their battle against the loneliness and despair of homeless children and families.

Intricately tied in with efforts to solve the homeless problem are the housing programs funded in H.R. 2916. The bill provides a total of \$11.8 billion for these various programs, including \$8.9 billion for housing assistance and \$1.8 billion for public housing operating subsidies. I am especially pleased that once again the Appropriations Committee has rejected administration proposals to convert all new housing subsidies into housing vouchers. It is important to note that the total funding for housing programs is 21 percent more than the fiscal year 1989 appropriations level and \$2 billion more than the apparent request by the administration. It seems the administration, unlike this body, does not recognize the grave housing needs of this Nation or simply is not willing to give more than lip service to efforts to solve the problem.

H.R. 2916 allocates \$1.4 billion for rental units for the elderly or handicapped under the section 202 program. Importantly, the bill directs HUD to address the snail's pace construction of section 202 projects—only 10 percent of pending projects were constructed last year—and to report to Congress on ways to complete these projects in a timely manner. I am especially pleased that \$6 million is included for congregate services at these housing projects which will promote and encourage the elderly and handicapped to maintain a maximum degree of independence in a home environment, thereby avoiding costly and premature or unnecessary institutionalization.

The bill provides a total of \$3 billion in fiscal year 1990 for the Community Development Block Grant Program which is equal to the level provided for fiscal year 1989. This program supplies much needed development assistance to towns and cities throughout West Virginia and the Nation.

Finally, I would like to mention the funding included for the Environmental Protection Agency, a total of \$5.4 billion for fiscal year 1990. Of great importance to West Virginia is the \$2 billion allocated for construction grants to municipal, State, and interstate agencies to assist with the planning, design, and construction of wastewater treatment facilities. I am pleased to note that this is 69 percent more

than the administration wanted. Adequate funding is especially important this year in view of the fact that this is the last year that funds are authorized for wastewater treatment construction grants—in the future, funding for such construction will be transferred to State revolving funds. Many communities in West Virginia are struggling to comply with the secondary sewage treatment standards mandated by the Clean Water Act. The funding provided by this measure for the sewer grants program is critical for these and other communities throughout the Nation which simply do not have the financial resources to meet the sewage treatment requirements on their own.

To close Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important appropriations measure.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, while I understand the difficulty of responding to all the needs covered in the HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill, and while I want to commend the appropriation of \$11.6 billion for veterans' medical programs and the rejection of administration requests to further decrease the staffing of VA hospitals, I want to express my regret that the committee omitted further funding for programs under the Veterans' Job Training Act.

This is an omission that is part and parcel of the hardships all veterans have faced as a result the large deficits associated with Reaganomics and the repeated administration attempts to cut domestic spending. As a result, programs funded under the Veterans' Job Training Act [VJTA] will stop.

The Veterans' Job Training Act originated in 1983 as the Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act to provide jobless veterans with assistance so that they could secure permanent private-sector employment. This was not an act of charity, but instead a tribute to those Americans who sacrificed and served their country during the Korean conflict and the Vietnam era.

The act sought to help solve the severe, continuing unemployment that these veterans continue to face, by providing training and incentives to employers to hire worthy veterans. The program has been a resounding success. In western Pennsylvania alone, the program has provided local businesses with over \$11.1 million to train 2,794 veterans since 1983.

Despite these successes, only \$220,000 currently remains available in this program nationwide. Although Congress authorized an additional \$30 million in fiscal year 1987 and \$60 million every year between fiscal year 1988 and fiscal year 1990, those have been empty authorizations. An authorization and a dime gets you a cup of coffee. No funds were appropriated since 1987, and that is the bottom line. Emphasizing different priorities, the Reagan and Bush budgets have consistently excluded requests for funding of the Veterans' Job Training Act. And, with all our dollars spoken for, no further funds have been provided.

It is a tragedy that funds have been allowed to run out on one of the most successful pro-

grams of its kind. Veterans have a higher unemployment rate than other groups and remain out of work longer. This unemployment continues despite the demand for trained employees in many of this country's high-technology growth industries. As recently as last year, this program was finding approximately 600 veterans jobs each month. Due to budget constraints, however, the VJTA currently helps fewer than 50 veterans nationwide each month.

In my Pittsburgh district, many of the middle-aged workers who risked their lives in Korea and Vietnam were forced into an early retirement during the collapse of the steel industry in the early 1980's. The pensions they receive are not enough to cover the costs of home ownership, let alone obligations for sons and daughters approaching college age. These are proud, capable and mature workers who must turn either to minimum wage jobs or unemployment. These men and women have risked their lives in service to their country and lost their jobs through unfair trade practices. And now budget cuts eliminate one of the most proven ways to full employment and a better life.

As we all know, the national interest demands we do our level best to reduce the deficit. But deficit reduction should not be made at the expense of veterans. Although I will support H.R. 2916 as it comes to the floor today, I hope to see the day when the administration joins the Congress in advancing the proper budget priorities to address basic needs.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposed appropriation for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for independent agencies for fiscal year 1990.

In particular, I wish to speak in support of the bill's funding for VA medical care.

The state of affairs at this country's VA medical centers is every bit as much a scandal as the much-publicized problems at the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

More than a year ago, I began hearing an increasing number of complaints from patients and caregivers alike regarding the quality of care at the Portland VA Medical Center and cutbacks in many VA health care programs.

The information my office has accumulated since then about the quality of care at the Portland VA Medical Center is both shocking and disturbing.

Consider these facts:

When the new Portland VA Medical Center opened in February 1988, one 39-bed ward was not opened because of the funding shortages. Since then, an additional 40 beds have been closed due to funding shortages.

During the month of February 1989 alone, an estimated 39 ambulances that normally would have come to the VA medical center were turned away because of funding shortages. Veterans turned away must then pay for the medical care they receive at these other facilities.

Hours of nursing care per patient at the Portland VA Medical Center are substantially below VA standards.

Because of budget shortfalls, the Portland VA is slated to cease treating 1,552 nonpriority veterans.

The great irony in Portland is that we have a gleaming new VA medical center paid for with Federal funds—but we don't have enough money to provide care to needy veterans.

The roots of the problem—both in Oregon and nationwide—go back several years, when the Reagan administration said it could adequately care for veterans' needs with fewer dollars. The cuts we are seeing today clearly show that the Reagan administration was not straight with Congress.

What is happening in veterans health care facilities around the country is not right. It is not fair. And it is not moral. Our Nation should not subject its veterans—in their greatest hour of need—to substandard health care. Nor should it be turning away veterans who, by serving their country, earned the right to receive that medical care.

Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the bill before us today provides a 6-percent increase in current-dollar funding for the VA medical system. This is enough to preserve the current level of staffing at VA facilities nationwide.

I'm particularly pleased to see that the legislation rejects the administration's proposal to decrease total staffing for VA hospitals.

Unfortunately, this bill will not provide our Nation's veterans with the quality and level of medical care that they deserve. But it will stop the bleeding in the VA medical system. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2916, the Housing and Urban Development and Veterans Affairs appropriations of 1989. I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the ranking Republican member from New York [Mr. GREEN], for their diligent efforts to bring this legislation before the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that one of the most pressing issues facing our Nation today is the question of affordable housing. If our Nation is to live up to its potential for greatness, all Americans must believe that they are shareholders in the American dream of one day owning a home.

Today many Americans find home ownership virtually an impossible dream. The lack of affordable, decent housing has become so pronounced in some regions of the country that many people despair that they will never have a home that they call their own.

For this reason, I am a strong supporter for H.R. 2916 which will provide \$456,200,000 for programs to assist the homeless in HUD, VA, and FEMA. This represents full funding for all of the Stewart B. McKinney Act programs within the subcommittee's jurisdiction—a call for funding which has been strongly supported by both the President and Secretary Kemp.

Mr. Chairman, throughout our evening news programs and news tabloids we hear of the scandals which have in the past encompassed the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Yet, we have failed to recognize the one man, who has diligently and masterfully carried the banner for those who are dependent and in need of the many out-

standing programs which HUD stands to offer. I am of course speaking of Jack Kemp, the distinguished Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Secretary Kemp, on a number of occasions, has gone on record stating that he wants "to use the full resources of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to help wage war on poverty." Accordingly, Secretary Kemp has expediently and wholeheartedly participated in the cleanup of the programs which have sidetracked the needy of our Nation as well as our Nation's housing policy.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Kemp and H.R. 2916 provide the support needed to enhance decent, affordable housing for the people of the United States. We cannot afford to let an essential ingredient of the American dream—home ownership—to remain only a dream and not a reality. For this reason I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2916.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Chairman, during consideration of fiscal year 1989 HUD appropriations in the 100th Congress, I voted for the Schumer amendment because it was my understanding then that it would not put the space program in jeopardy. Today, however, the space program would definitely be adversely affected by the amendment offered by Mr. SCHUMER. For that reason, I cannot support my colleague from New York.

I vehemently disagree with any attempt to gut the space program which is vital to the future of this country. On the contrary, I am committed to doing everything in my power to enhance the space program which means continued research and development in technology and medicine and which also contributes to the economic well-being of the entire United States as well as the economically depressed Southwest. In the past two decades, the country has enjoyed the fruits of the technological and medical advancements of this critical program and all of us will be the poorer if we don't allow the program to remain healthy.

In light of the above considerations, I am duty bound to vote against the Schumer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in House Report 101-152 by, and if offered by, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] or his designee. Said amendments may be considered en bloc and may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and are debatable for 60 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto. Said amendments shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2916

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress, assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans

Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to provide an explanation to the Members of why, at the appropriate time in the reading of the bill on page 12, I will make a point of order against a provision which allows for a pay shift from one fiscal year to the present fiscal year, from fiscal year 1990 to fiscal year 1989.

First of all, let me indicate my greatest respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], and his ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for the dedication and commitment that they have to the issues that are before their subcommittee. They have done an excellent job in trying to balance some very difficult priorities between issues related to housing, the environment, veterans and space, issues that are important to the people of this country as well as to our future. They have every right to fight for full funding for the priorities that are before their committee, and I commend them for the fight that they make. Indeed, they would not be responsible were they not fighting for full funding.

Second, they have every right to be treated equally with every other area of the budget.

For that reason, I do not come to the floor here to blame them for trying to implement the same kind of pay shift that Secretary Cheney is trying to implement in the Department of Defense to try to obtain additional outlays for expenditures in fiscal year 1990.

The tactic is simple. Instead of paying individuals in fiscal year 1990, you simply move the date back and you save yourself additional outlays to be spent in that year.

The problem is that this approach undercuts the budget agreement and the budget resolution. These are illusory savings. They are not real savings. They are the worst kind of smoke and mirrors and accounting games. They result in additional expenditures beyond the targets established by the budget resolution.

The second point is that they set a terrible precedent in terms of enforcing the budget resolution. It is a legitimate argument that if you do it for defense, then why not do it for the Post Office, why not do it for veterans? Why not do it for Social Security?

Indeed, if you decided to take all the benefits that the Federal Government pays at the beginning of the fiscal year and move them into this fiscal year, it is about \$30 billion. So it sets a terrible precedent.

But lastly and most importantly, when we agreed to the budget agreement with the administration and the leadership of the Congress, we agreed to certain numbers, and we did not assume any pay shifts. This issue was raised, and it was debated.

□ 1230

We said no pay shifts are involved when we decided the numbers included in the budget resolution. Otherwise, very frankly, we would have agreed to a different set of numbers.

Unfortunately, and it is unfortunate, the administration is taking the position now that it is OK for the Defense Department to do it but other agencies are going to be restricted. That is not the position that the Committee on the Budget or the leadership in both the House and the Senate are going to take with regard to our implementation of the budget resolution. Our position is that we will oppose all pay shifts. Furthermore, the Congressional Budget Office will not score these shifts when it comes to determining accounting versus the budget resolution, and we intend not only to fight these issues with regard to pay shifts on appropriations measures but, indeed, with regard to the authorizing measures.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to offer an amendment that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] has proposed to eliminate the Secretary's power this year to make a pay date shift.

I recognize that these are not pleasant results for anyone and, yet, I think we have to stop kidding the American people about where we are at. We cannot continue to promise more space programs, we cannot continue to promise more money for housing, we cannot continue to promise more money for day care, we cannot continue to promise more money for education, and for other programs and not tell the American people how we are going to pay for these programs.

The basic point is that we cannot afford it, and we have to find the resources to deal with these kinds of priorities and, indeed, the President of the United States ought to say how we are going to pay for these priorities.

Mr. Chairman, that is where we are. It is a harsh reality. I recognize that. I think the place to start is now, and if we can do that, it will be a healthy beginning.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman from California in his statements. I support his accolades of the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from New York. I support his opposition to date shifting, and I support his position of consistency

which says we have to make it apply to all of them. I also support his emotional outburst, because I feel the same depth about the problem of the deficit which we are simply postponing and sweeping under the rug.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. TRAXLER and by unanimous consent, Mr. PANETTA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to extend my deep appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget. The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has treated this subcommittee and the members and myself with great courtesy. And I might add that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] has always been forthcoming and forthright as to what their views were. Certainly in our relations with the Committee on the Budget, we have absolutely no complaints in the courtesies which have been extended to us by the chairman and the ranking member. I might add that the staff of the Committee on the Budget has also been most helpful in assisting us in determining precisely where we were in scorekeeping.

Mr. Chairman, a little later on when we get to the across-the-board amendment, I will want to say a few words about some of the issues that the gentleman has raised, and I will defer my comments to that time.

Before we get there, I want him to know, and also the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, that we as Members of this body are appreciative of the diligence and the commitment that they have exercised toward budgeteering and maintaining and upholding whatever agreements are reached. It is a difficult task, and I do not envy them in that work. I think they have performed it most honorably.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman that from this side of the aisle I do not find the gentleman's remarks harsh in the least. I think he is very generous in recognizing that we seek only to be treated like everyone else in this House, and I hope that we will be treated like everyone else in this House as this drama unfolds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## TITLE I

### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

#### VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

##### COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 92 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of Article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, and for other benefits as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, 412, 777, and 806, chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 50 U.S.C. App. 540-548; 43 Stat. 122, 123; 45 Stat. 735; 76 Stat. 1198), \$15,367,506,000, to remain available until expended.

##### READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 21, 30, 31, 34-36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61), \$434,100,000, to remain available until expended. Any funds transferred to this account from the Veterans' Job Training appropriation under the authority of section 126 of Public Law 98-151 which were not returned to the Veterans' Job Training appropriation as authorized by section 16 of Public Law 98-77, as amended, shall be available until expended for all expenses of this account, which until March 31, 1990, shall be deemed to include such expenses as may be incurred in carrying out the purposes of section 18 of Public Law 98-77, as amended.

##### VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapter 19; 70 Stat. 887; 72 Stat. 487), \$13,940,000, to remain available until expended.

##### LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

###### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary to carry out loan guaranty and insurance operations, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapter 37, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title), \$453,000,000, to remain available until expended.

During 1990, the resources of the loan guaranty revolving fund shall be available for expenses for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapter 37, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title): *Provided*, That the unobligated balances, including retained earnings of the direct loan revolving fund, shall be available, during 1990, for transfer to the loan guaranty revolving fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the timely payment of obligations of such fund, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall not be required to pay interest on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer.

During 1990, with the resources available, gross obligations for direct loans and total commitments to guarantee loans are authorized in such amounts as may be neces-

sary to carry out the purposes of the "Loan guaranty revolving fund".

#### DIRECT LOAN REVOLVING FUND

During 1990, within the resources available, not to exceed \$1,000,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans (38 U.S.C. chapter 37).

#### VETERANS HEALTH SERVICE AND RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

##### MEDICAL CARE

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies and equipment; funeral, burial and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries receiving care in Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); aid to State homes as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 641); and not to exceed \$2,000,000 to fund cost comparison studies as referred to in 38 U.S.C. 5010(a)(5); \$11,561,431,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That of the sum appropriated, \$7,220,000,000 is available only for expenses in the personnel compensation and benefits object classifications: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$268,882,000 is for the equipment and land and structures object classifications only, which amount shall not become available for obligation until August 1, 1990, and pursuant to section 202(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987, this action is a necessary (but secondary) result of a significant policy change.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the language in H.R. 2916 on page 5, beginning with the word "and" on line 22 and going through the end of line 25 constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of rule XXI, clause 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan wish to respond?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEILENSEN). The point of order is conceded, and the point of order is sustained.

#### AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. SCHUMER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer en bloc amendments made in order by the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. SCHUMER:

Page 5, line 15, strike "\$11,561,431,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$11,801,431,000".

Page 12, line 22, strike "\$9,145,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,515,000,000".

Page 13, line 7, strike "\$883,830,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,013,830,000".

Page 13, line 10, strike "\$7,796,258,750" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,036,258,750".

Page 19, line 5, strike "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000".

Page 32, line 24, strike "\$785,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$885,000,000".

Page 43, line 15, strike "\$5,203,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,489,100,000".

Mr. SCHUMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the en bloc amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer here today poses this body with a stark choice: Fund programs for our veterans, our children and our elderly, or give an increase in funding for the space station.

Ladies and gentleman, first before I begin my remarks, let me thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan, for his kindness and his understanding. He has been a gentleman throughout. Let me commend the gentleman from New Jersey, the chair of the authorizing committee, for his strong fight and leadership in space, and both the ranking minority on the appropriating and the authorizing committees for their consideration.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is painful to come to the floor and make choices, but that is what we must do here today.

This morning our President announced his plans for a space station, a station on the Moon, and a landing on Mars by the year 2010. That will cost us \$400 billion, and we cannot have space exploration by press release. We must have space exploration by money.

Once we talk about money, ladies and gentlemen, we must have choices. This amendment, the Schumer amendment, is offered for several reasons. First, it is to require us to make those choices.

The chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Mississippi, came up and praised the committee for doing all it could within its confines, but said that veterans' health care is not funded to the level

that it should be. The gentleman from New York, my good colleague and friend, came here and said that housing is not funded to what it should be. The gentlewoman from Louisiana, my good friend, came here and said that we are doing the best within the constraints of this bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, the leading constraint within this bill is the huge increase for the space station. In fact, last year, this year, we appropriated \$900 million, and it will go up, if the Schumer amendment does not pass, by a whopping 84 percent.

What this amendment does is it gives an increase for the space station, but it says that there are other priorities that are more important: taking care of the health of our veterans, educating our children in a safe environment, housing the people who have been so neglected over the past decade. Yes, here on Earth, ladies and gentlemen, and let me say, first, that I am a believer in space exploration. It can improve technology, help our economy stay innovative and current, and uncover vast new worlds that excite the imagination, but we cannot have everything. We can say we can, but we cannot.

This amendment says that here on Earth we have millions of people living on our streets, a plague of drug abuse spreading from our big cities to our smallest towns, and millions of veterans who urgently need the medical care that has been promised them.

□ 1240

On all of these issues, by our own admission, this Government spends only a fraction of what is needed. So I ask my colleagues, as we reach for the stars, let us not forget those who live underneath them. As we try to discover distant worlds, let us not forget our own planet.

My amendment would grant the space station a 4-percent increase in funding, enough to keep up with inflation, but transfers money to critically needed service programs around the country.

The amendment is supported by a variety of groups. I will just mention some of them. The American Legion supports this amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SCHUMER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just talked to the American Legion a few moments ago, and the American Legion tells me they do not support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Reclaiming my time, we have a letter from the American Legion which I will share with the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. The American Legion states that they do not support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. We will show the gentleman from Pennsylvania the letter.

Also supporting my amendment are the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Association of Retired people, the National Education Association, and AFSCME, among other groups. So there are many people in this country, as these groups represent, saying yes, we need to explore space, but no, this kind of money for the space station compared to our other priorities is not adequate.

Second, the space station itself is misguided if one wants to explore space. It is gold plating. It is the kind of thing that costs a lot of money, and I realize that that creates some jobs, but it is not the best way, according to so many scientists, of exploring space.

Thomas Donahue, the prestigious University of Michigan scientist who chaired a space advisory committee for NASA, said he did not know what experiments could be put on the space station.

James Van Allen, the one who the rings are named after and the radiation belts, called the space station "a solution in search of a problem." Again, my colleagues, this is one of our leading astrophysicists who says it is "a solution in search of a problem."

Even Ronald Reagan's science adviser, George Keyworth, called the space station "an unfortunate step backward."

Yet here we are ready to spend \$30 billion over the next 7 years for a station that will mean less money to fight crime, less money to educate our youngsters. For what?

I would submit to all of my colleagues, many of us do wish to explore space, but the space station is another B-2. We start spending money for it, we will not find an adequate purpose for it, and then as the cost goes up, and up and up, the only justification for spending additional dollars will be that we have spent so many already.

Let us stop this kind of folly, my colleagues. We are not saying end the space station. But what we are saying is fund it at a little more than last year's level, and let us see if we can really spend the huge amount of dollars that the space station would require.

There is a better way, my colleagues. There are unmanned space probes, and in the last three decades the overwhelming majority of scientific and economic progress has come out of the investment in unmanned space probes.

It was robot satellites in earth orbit that revolutionized global communications and navigation.

It was satellites that have changed our understanding of the atmosphere, the ozone layer, our weather, the dis-

tribution of natural resources, and how our oceans function.

Yet, these kinds of great programs are being slashed to make room for this huge, expensive, unwieldy, and unneeded space station.

So in conclusion, my colleagues, the space station is squeezing out needed programs in space. The space station is squeezing out needed programs on Earth.

The bottom line, my colleagues, is that we should make science policy on what is good and what is needed. We should not make science policy based on what makes for the best press release.

The bottom line is there is not enough money to fight crime, clean the environment, house the homeless, feed the hungry, and educate the young here on Earth. Building the space station will mean less not only in these programs, but less for the really successful space programs.

This is ultimately, my colleagues, a question of priorities. The American people want us to spend their money wisely. Let us spend it where we can get the most bang for the buck scientifically, and where it can do the most good for those who live under the stormy skies here on Earth.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me at the outset say that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] recognized and has identified a number of concerns that many Members of this body would agree with and would not be in opposition to. The concept that our Nation needs additional funding for very vital areas of this budget is a fact that I do not think any one of us can disagree with. In that sense I want to applaud the gentleman from New York for recognizing what I see as shortfalls within the appropriations of this subcommittee.

I might also add to his list. I could put together a rather extensive list which, incidentally, would include the agency from which he would take the money to do the things which are necessary, and in many respects with which I do not disagree.

We have reduced this bill from the President's request for NASA by approximately \$1 billion. That was a painful decision, with painful results which I found very, very difficult to accept.

This bill, in my judgment, recognizes the necessity for balancing the equities between the various agencies within the subcommittee's jurisdic-

tion. I think on review, we all recognize there are across this Nation people who will speak on behalf of each of the agencies within this committee's jurisdiction—they would speak for the VA, they would speak for HUD, they would speak for NASA, they would speak for the academic community and the National Science Foundation. And certainly every environmentalist would tell us we need more funding for the general purposes and principles that EPA represents. There are others who would look at the 15 remaining independent agencies, smaller agencies that I think have some important impacts. We have the American Battle Monuments Commission, a very tiny agency, incidentally, that cares for our overseas cemeteries where our war heroes are buried, a very small appropriation. One could reach across this bill and say I have a favorite topic here. The gentleman from New York does not pick one favorite topic—he touches several of them to transfer funds. I have no quarrel with what he would like to do except for one thing. He takes the money out of NASA, specifically the space station. I must say that we have labored very diligently, as a good parent ought to, to balance the equities between the various agencies that are within the subcommittee's jurisdiction. The committee strove mightily to recognize the needs of the veterans, of our environment, of housing for low-income people—and Members are going to hear more about that later—elderly housing programs that the gentleman is aware of and seeks to add to—and we have tried the very best we could to attend to that—and the Elderly Congregate Services Program.

The gentleman from New York has distributed the reduction in NASA among various agencies. I would say as we crafted this bill we sought mightily and with great diligence to balance the equities here among these competing interests.

I cannot tell Members that we were absolutely and totally correct and that no Member's judgment could supersede ours. But I can tell them that from the members on the committee who represent disparate points of view, differences of opinion, and points of view, they felt comfortable with what we put together. I felt comfortable, not because I was totally satisfied with what was done, but given the financial resources presented to us, I thought that it was the best product that we could come forward with.

I am going to ask Members this afternoon to say no to the gentleman from New York's amendment, because I think if Members look at the total bill, it represents the keenest kinds of balance that can be achieved among all of these worthy endeavors which

the people of America look to the Congress and the President to protect and enhance.

I trust and believe that the amendment will be rejected.

□ 1250

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER].

Mr. CARPER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me preface my remarks by saying I realize what a difficult task the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], and members of the subcommittee are faced with in trying to craft this bill today. I applaud them for their efforts.

Mr. Chairman, the Schumer amendment, and those of us who support it, do not intend to reflect badly on the subcommittee's efforts. We understand how difficult their task is.

We are faced today, and others have said we are faced today, with a series of hard choices. I think all of us in this country would like to again enjoy the unchallenged leadership in space perhaps we once did. All of us in this country would like to reverse the rise in homelessness and see some increase in the rise in homeownership.

All of us would like to be able to respond to the pleas of our veterans for better medical care. All of us would like to see the day come when the rains that fall from the skies would not bring, as they did last night, acids to poison our rivers, lakes, and streams.

We also know that while we would like to have those things, we have to be willing to pay for them. There is a reluctance in this body and there is a reluctance in the White House to raise taxes to pay for more spending. We know we cannot go deeper and deeper into debt and borrow the money for these programs.

The funds, as it turns out, must come from some other programs.

I believe we should have a space program in this country. I believe that is important for the United States. I believe that the idea of a manned colony on the Moon at some point in time may be desirable and a manned mission to Mars could be desirable as well.

Having said that, I also think we need to provide, as a first priority, a decent place for families to live here on Mother Earth and in this country.

I believe we do need to provide adequate health care for our veterans whether it is in Delaware or New York or in any other State.

Finally, I think we have to provide a safe living environment not just for a future colony on the Moon or a possible manned mission to Mars, but a safe

clean environment right here where we live.

The Schumer amendment does not eliminate the space station. It provides \$1 billion next year for the space station, which is actually a small increase in current funding for that program.

It does, however, reorder our priorities. It reorders them in a way I am comfortable with, and I hope a majority of my colleagues will be comfortable with.

The Schumer amendment represents a policy that we call pay-as-you-go. It is a policy that I think is fiscally responsible and I believe deserves our support today.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, today we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the United States landing on the Moon. The scenes of that historic event are still fresh in our memory. That one small step inspired this Nation, stirred our dreams, and opened an era of discovery.

With this amendment we reduce the growth in spending for the space station and dedicate those funds to other frontiers, other challenges, other dreams.

Our Nation came to its feet to cheer an astronaut's step into immortality. Today we can set a new national goal, the goal of safe housing for our Americans, health for our children, security for the elderly and the veterans who risked their lives so we could have our peaceful dreams.

Bringing children in from the cold and the crime of the streets to a safe home does not have the pageantry of an astronaut girded for exploration hurtling into space. But our Nation can come to see a national goal of decent and affordable shelter as a great victory over the elements.

Protecting kids from cancer and disease may not bring the same rush of emotion as a liftoff from the Cape but there is as great a promise in a healthy child as in a conquered frontier.

We need not look to the heavens to find our future inspiration; we can find it in neighborhoods redeemed from violence and poverty; children well schooled, healthy and anxious to lead, and elderly Americans with dignity and security.

This amendment is a small step for this Congress, but if it leads to a commitment to compassion and fairness by our Nation, it too can bring a chorus of pride from future generations.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to subdivide that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have heard some interesting rhetoric but maybe we ought to look at what the actual amendment is that we are debating. That is the amendment made in order by the Committee on Rules. It is an amendment that reduces the NASA research and development account by \$714 million, period.

The amendment as it has been made in order by the Committee on Rules does not specify to what programs the cuts would apply. It certainly does not specify that the cuts could only come out of the space station. In fact, the space station is substantially less than half the funds in that account, about \$1.6 billion, as I remember, out of the account of \$5.2 billion, as the account now stands.

So in fact the space station is less than a third of that account.

As the Schumer amendment is drafted, NASA is perfectly free to keep the Space Station Program intact and to take that money out of many other things that NASA is doing.

Moreover, even within the space station account there are a lot of different things going on. For example, under the Schumer amendment, if NASA chose to take some of that funding out of the space station they could take it out of work package 3, which happens to be the Earth orbiting satellite that is a key part of Mission to Planet Earth.

If NASA chose to do that, it would be absolutely destructive to the Mission to Planet Earth Program.

There are many other things that NASA could choose to do that are included within that account. We have money in here for a satellite to observe what is happening to the ozone layer.

The only satellite we have up there now is deteriorating very badly. The data we are getting from it is increasingly garbled and unreliable and if we do not move quickly to replace it we shall no longer know what is happening to the upper atmospheric ozone.

Yet that is something that NASA could easily do under the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

I should also point out that even if the gentleman from New York persuades NASA to take all the money out of the space station, in the long run that is going to be extremely destructive to that which he wants to accomplish by his amendment, because I can assure the gentleman from New York that the one thing that is going to drive the cost of the space station through the roof is to go the route that he is proposing and buy it a little bit at a time.

We have put a big cut already in the space station program. We have cut it almost \$400 million below what the administration requested. In response to what we have done, NASA in fact is, during this month, engaged in a review of the scope of the space station to see how to accommodate to that level of change.

But I think everyone who is connected with the program agrees that if we drop to the level that the gentleman from New York is proposing we would be dropping to a level which is just going to drag this program out indefinitely and increase its costs enormously.

As those costs increase in that program, under the plan that the gentleman from New York has put forth, there is less and less left in our bill for programs for veterans, for programs to deal with pollution control and research, for programs to provide housing subsidies, for programs for the elderly, for congregate services.

So the gentleman really saves a penny this year but he will be giving pounds and pounds in future years as his approach to this program drives the station costs through the roof. That is not a prudent way to go. Perhaps if the gentleman from New York has proposed terminating the Space Station Program we would be having a different debate here today. But the gentleman from New York has not done that. He is simply following a course which in the long run is going to be very destructive, very expensive, and in the end we shall have much less money for the program that is dear to his heart. I think that is a poor approach to this issue, and I hope that my colleagues will reject it this year as they rejected it last year.

□ 1300

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman indicate that the gentleman from New York's amendment simply strikes the money, and does not move it to housing?

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman's amendment, as set forth in the report of the Committee on Rules, reduces the research and development account as NASA by \$714 million in the NASA portion, and adds money in other portions of the bill not related to NASA.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, does not the money added in, include money for housing?

Mr. GREEN. I did not challenge that. My only argument is that, if Members go about the development of the space station as the gentleman proposes, Members are in the end going to increase the space station costs very materially. At that point, our subcommittee will have less

money left for housing, we shall have less money left for veterans, less money left for environment, and then in the end the amendment that the gentleman from New York offers will be very damaging to the causes that he seeks to advance.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to my colleague from New York's amendment to transfer \$714 million from the Space Station Program and reallocate it to other programs authorized under this bill.

I'm afraid it is a case of "here we go again—the U.S. Congress is trying to pull the rug out from under NASA." I am perplexed that this situation reoccurs, especially when Americans continuously put space high on their list of priorities.

If the Schumer amendment were to prevail, the Space Station Program would be effectively dead. NASA would have no alternative but to recommend to the President that the Space Station Program be canceled.

As one Representative from Houston, TX, the home of the Johnson Space Center, I have a vested interest in the success of the Space Station Program. The Space Station Program has unquestionably contributed to the recent upturn in the Houston economy.

But, the program's contribution to Houston is minuscule compared to the benefits a manned space station will have on the country as a whole. Like previous space endeavors which established the United States as the leader in space, space station Freedom will generate not only new knowledge, but also, new industries, new products, new jobs, and greater innovation that will benefit the American economy.

The Space Station Program is a project of international significance. The United States is not the only nation involved in building the space station Freedom. The European Space Agency, Canada, and Japan have contributed heavily to the program. Space station Freedom has become the symbol of our commitment to our allies. If we do not continue our leadership, nations will seek partners other than the United States to benefit from space, and we will have reneged on an international commitment.

Mr. Chairman, the first obligation of each generation is to invest in the next. Twenty years ago today, Neil Armstrong's walk on the Moon paved the way for the next generation. The Space Station Program is a symbol of our Nation's commitment to the innovative use of space for all mankind. Now more than ever we must pave the way for the next generation to give them the edge in technology and discovery so that they can continue our

role in world leadership and our efforts toward an improved quality of life for all mankind.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I was thinking to myself what I wanted to say today, and I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], that he is doing a great service today in offering the amendment that he is offering today. I think it is time that the House spoke to the issue, does it want a space program or does it not want a space program.

Today, as we celebrate the 20th anniversary of landing on the Moon, I remember well and maybe other Members do, too, "The Eagle has landed, the Eagle has landed, the Eagle has landed," and all over the world, the world stopped, because something tremendous had happened.

In all the history of mankind, through science, space, technology, and engineering, and most important, people, we had people walking on the Moon. We named the space station, "Space Station Freedom," and we talked a little bit today about planet Earth and gravity and all the other things we are talking about.

I want to explode a myth, if I can, in the few minutes we have. Peaceful use of space is essential to mankind, and the myth we have to shatter, that space is a luxury. Space is not a luxury. The space program produces almost a million jobs on Earth. Those are resources for people to buy homes and to educate their children. It is creating the new wealth that this country needs. The economic ratio in the United States, for every dollar we spend on Earth, for the space program, it produces \$5 or five times the economic dynamics for this country in cities and communities and States throughout this Nation.

World communications would be impossible, had we not entered into space. Instantaneous communications, where Americans can fax a particular communique from here to Bombay, people would never have been able to do that before 10 years ago, if we did not have the space program.

Let me say one other thing, and I am going to close on two points, because I am going to try to save a little extra time. The security of the Nation depends on our space program. There is no way we could monitor the security of the Nation without the space program.

Let me conclude on this, because I want to turn back some of my time for other Members, I have spoken on this

issue, forgive me, a thousand times. I, too, am a veteran. I served in World War II in a combat infantry unit. I do not want to be in the Congress of the United States in dealing bonbons, where we pick a bonbon out of the box, because I get 30 votes here, because a Member is afraid in 2 years' time that the veterans will be mad at them. I say to my veterans in New Jersey, right now, the future of mankind depends on this program, and if the veterans in New Jersey do not want to support BOB ROE anymore, then elect somebody else, but I will not give up the bonbons, the needs of this country to try to win votes in a coalition, and bring in the poor souls who have not got homes, the homeless involved, and the veterans, and the American Legion coming back and saying to this, when they are the first ones who come in and speak to the security of this Nation. So let me challenge everybody here today, we can do better, and we can do both. We should not pit brother against brother and sister against sister, nor should we force our country into deciding a one-future nation. The future of this country, the future of this world, depends on our neighbor space. That is where the real world is. I hope Members will defeat this amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to make three brief points.

First, communications are important. The space station, not the space program, but the space station, with this amendment, has nothing to do with communications. Second, it has no military applications, according to many of our generals. And third, in reference to what the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from New Jersey said, it is not this amendment that is pitting program against program, it is the fact that the space station under this bill is going up 84 percent, \$700 million, and that the other programs do not have the money left. So do not blame the amendment. It is the fact of the huge cost of the space station crowding out all the other programs that is causing the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of man's walk on the Moon, it is indeed tempting to burst with national pride and say "Onward, outward, and farther into space," but this is precisely the moment to hold the very kind of debate we are having today on national priorities. Whether to make the broad choices that we ought to be

making, not micromanaging within the internal operation of this or that agency budget, but making the broad public policy choices on whether to send men to the Moon, where we will house the six fittest among us on the Moon, or to house the poorest and neediest among us on Earth. Whether we should launch man on a journey, a \$25 billion-a-year journey from the Moon, on to Mars, a journey on which we will be spending more in each year than we spent in the whole 10-year period of the effort to land a man on the Moon. Or whether we should be spending money on crowded bridges, crowded highways, crowded airports right here on Earth.

The very gentlemen who want to get man to the Moon and to Mars' surface, cannot get people downtown, cannot get people into the Nation's airports. Last year we had 100,000 hours of delay at O'Hare Airport. That will triple in a decade when three more airports will join O'Hare in the 100,000-hour delay club. There are 25 airports around the country that are experiencing as much as 50,000 hours of delay, and we should be launching ourselves on a mission to Mars?

I am for science in space. I think it is important. However, for 10 percent of the cost of manned space science, we can do all the science we need in outer space. We need not put men in space with these greatly restricted financial resources we have, at 10 times the cost of unmanned space science studies. I say let Members focus our resources, make this broad policy choice that we are confronted with here in the Schumer amendment; focus those resources where they are most needed, which is here on Earth. Confront, think about this, confront this \$12 billion-a-year space budget with a \$5 billion budget for cleaning up water on Earth.

Vote for the Schumer transfer amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want a good space program. I was at Cape Kennedy 20 years ago with the mission launch that sent Neil Armstrong to the Moon. It was a wonderful experience. It was inspiring.

However, the fact is that the budget for the space station is up 85 percent and everything else in our domestic budget is getting crunched. The President is now announcing a grandiose scheme to go ahead with the space station, go ahead with the Moon colony, and go on to a manned mission to Mars. It all sounds terrific.

The problem is, it is not built on bonbons, as the gentleman from New Jersey suggested, it is built on cotton candy. It is all froth.

□ 1310

It is all froth, all fluff, because there are no dollars here to pay for it. The President has designed a beautiful, grandiose, imaginative mission with no way to pay for it; there is no design there.

We do a disservice to the space program if we allow these budget increases to continue without knowing where the money is going to come from. Today we have \$1.6 billion in the budget for the space station. Within a year and a half we are going to have \$3 billion. Where is the money going to come from? We ought to know that now before we begin to add to that budget.

The beauty of the Schumer amendment is that it recognizes, yes, we want to explore the universe, but for most people the universe they experience for all of their lives will be right here on this planet. And if we take a look at their everyday living universe, what do we see? We see lousy housing, we see inadequate education, we see schools loaded with asbestos. I used to work with asbestos. I know how dangerous it is to kids and adults.

The best thing to do today, if we care about the integrity of the space station, is to send a message that we are not going to fund these increases until the President shows us how we are going to pay for them. Meanwhile, we are not going to let this space station squeeze out the other mercy initiatives in this budget right here at home for people who need housing, for veterans who need decent health care, or for schools kids who need a safe place to go to school.

That is all we are trying to do. We are trying to not only deal with the problems that every human being has in his own universe. We are also trying to send a message to the President: "Don't sell the country on these grandiose plans until you've got a way to pay for it," because if we do not have a way to pay for it, all of those plans are going to come down in a crashing heap once more, great expectations ruined.

Mr. Chairman, that is not going to help the space program; this is not going to help national morale. The Schumer amendment will.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER], a member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, reasonable men can differ on this proposal, but I feel that it is just as important for us to go ahead with this space station effort as it is for us to fill these admittedly unmet domestic needs of our society.

We are desperately underspending for our education, for elementary education, for preschool education, for literacy education, and for education in

science, technology, mathematics, and engineering, but does that mean that we should stop the space effort? No.

The question is not whether mankind is going to go to space. Mankind is going to go to space. The European space agency is going to get there. The Japanese are very likely to get there. The Russians are already there.

The decision we have to make today is whether we are going to deal ourselves out of participating in the space station effort and participating in cooperative space exploration efforts with other nations. Are we going to try to reassert primacy in space? Are we going to be an actor in space? We are and we must reassert our leadership in our civilian space program. To do less would abandon space activities to the military and deprive our citizens of the significant spinoffs benefiting all Americans.

There are unimaginable advantages derived from the process of getting into space. There are advances in health care, in the development of new drugs, and in the production of all kinds of new materials that can be produced in a vacuum, that whole new manufacturing environment.

Mr. Chairman, let us not deal ourselves out of space. Let us be a participant. Let us maintain American leadership in space, and we will find simultaneously a way to meet our admittedly unmet domestic needs.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, just this morning the President of the United States said that we should go the lower orbit and do the mission to Planet Earth so that somehow we can improve the environment of this world in the future. The President said this morning that we ought to go back to the Moon and establish a permanent base there so we can have another big project that pays back to the gross national product at a 9-to-1 ratio the same way Project Apollo did. The President said this morning that we should go on to Mars and fulfill man's destiny of exploring and learning.

The President said we ought to go the lower orbit, we ought to go to the Moon, and we ought to go to Mars, and the Schumer amendment says to all of that, "Hell, no, we won't go."

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. Chairman, everything we want to do in the future in space depends on our ability to build that space station.

What does it mean to say, "Hell, no, we won't go"? It means that we will retreat from world leadership in science, space, and technology, that we will retreat, not compete.

Will that be good for veterans? Will that be good for retired folks? Will

that be good for education or for all the good things we want here on Earth? Of course not. Retreat means a lower quality of life for the future. It means the future will be a little lesser rather than greater, and that would be tragic.

Do we really want to be the first generation in this Nation's history that leaves the Nation poorer for our having been here, or do we want to join with the President of the United States in making a choice for new goals and better priorities?

Twenty years ago we could have chosen to fund immediate needs and defer the future, but we were bigger, we were better and more visionary than that, and today, as a result of that vision, as a result of being bigger and better than that, we are infinitely better off.

Some have told us that they believe that "Hell, no, we won't go" is indeed a proper policy. I hope that this House will agree with us that America needs to be a Nation great enough to look outward rather than only inward.

Mr. Chairman, let us reject the Schumer amendment as one of those bad ideas that a great nation should never countenance.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], who has been a great fiscal watchdog in this House, if the President has suggested how we are going to pay for this \$400 billion project?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, what the President suggested is that there is a matter here of national will. If we have the will to do as much now as we had in the 1960's in terms of investment, we can do it. In the 1960's we had the will to invest 3.6 percent of the Federal budget for space. We can do that again. We are only investing 1 percent now.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is a saying attributed to the philosopher George Santayana to the effect that "those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it."

What we are seeing on the House floor today, in the attempt to gut the space program, is a lesson in history in the making. In 1961, President John Kennedy demonstrated remarkable vision and leadership by setting the United States on the path to the Moon. Twenty years ago today, that vision, that goal,

was achieved, in what many have called the most remarkable voyage since Christopher Columbus set foot in the New World. I find it ironic, therefore, that some in the party of John Kennedy are leading the charge to dismantle our space program. The comparison with Columbus is instructive. Five hundred years ago, Portugal and Spain were competing for leadership in exploring sea routes to the rich lands of the Orient, Columbus (an Italian by birth) approached leaders of the two nations, Portugal's king rejected his proposal; Spain's Queen Isabella agreed to underwrite the voyage. The result was that Portugal's once-rising star as a maritime power was eclipsed by that of Spain. Spain went on to build an empire which, in time, was eclipsed by yet another maritime power, England.

The lesson is that the nation which rests on its laurels, which rejects the challenges of succeeding eras, is doomed to the status of an also-ran.

The United States accepted the challenge posed by the Soviets in the 1960's, and achieved worldwide recognition as the leading space-faring nation. Then we walked away from the challenge, today, as we meet in this chamber, a Soviet space station is passing over our heads every 90 minutes. Today, on the 20th anniversary of the Apollo landing, there are no Americans in space.

If we vote today, on the 20th anniversary of the Apollo landing, to gut the Space Station Freedom, we will have no one to blame but ourselves if we fall into eclipse as a leader among nations.

The space station is our stepping stone to the Moon, and then to Mars. It is also our eye on the planet Earth, our best hope, really, for solving the problem of pollution, which is a worldwide epidemic respecting no national boundaries. It was through the technology of the space program that we gained our first real perspective on global warming, ozone layer depletion, deforestation, and other environmental scourges. It is through space technology that we will solve those problems.

If we turn our backs on that challenge today, Mr. Chairman, we will be doomed to repeat the harsh lessons of history, even on the very day we celebrate the anniversary of that remarkable achievement of 20 years ago. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Schumer amendment, and accept the mantle of leadership as a space-faring nation.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee on what I think is the best they could do under the circumstances. We should not be pitting the civilians' space program against all the other domestic programs, but that is what this amendment would do.

My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and I have worked very closely on Housing issues together, but I say to him that to cut more than \$700 million from this pro-

gram is to gut the space station program. This would be gutting the future of this country, and I have to oppose it. We could go and ask the woman who has had cataract surgery if the space program is not important to her. Or we could ask the person who has a pacemaker, who depended on the research and the technology that made possible under the space program. Or we could ask the person who takes blood pressure medication and who depended on the kind of research in the field of medicine that has been done in space, or we could ask the individual who has witnessed in his or her living room a people's quest for liberty, as we witnessed it in China.

Mr. Chairman, I say that we should oppose the Schumer amendment and stick with the committee.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Schumer amendment to provide additional, necessary funds to house our Nation's people, clean our children's water, and keep our commitment to provide health care to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I am as proud as any American can be about the accomplishments of our space program. Clearly, as we are now celebrating the 20 years since our astronauts walked on the face of the Moon, this is a time when we can reflect on our accomplishments and look to the future for achievements to come. But these historic events did not and do not happen in a vacuum. Today, millions of people live below the poverty line in this country. We have some 3 million people without homes. We have numerous environmental hazards that threaten the very health and safety of our citizenry which must be addressed. And Mr. Chairman, we are obviously not proud of these circumstances.

The Schumer amendment is an attempt to improve this bill by providing for planet Earth first. "Planet Earth first" is a goal that will be furthered by providing \$100 million for EPA pollution control and research, \$240 million in section 8 low-income housing rental subsidies, \$134 million to elderly housing programs, and \$240 million to essential veterans' medical services. This amendment still leaves the space station with over a 4-percent increase from fiscal year 1989 funds. NASA will still have \$938 million and real serious people problems would be addressed.

With the \$240 million this amendment for low-income housing rental subsidies, we can provide over 6,000 families with a place to live. A recent report issued by the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities and the Low Income Housing Information Services underscored the significant crisis faced

by low-income Americans trying to obtain affordable housing. According to the report, some 45 percent of all poor renter households—over 3 million households—paid at least 70 percent of their incomes for housing while 63 percent paid 50 percent or more for housing in 1985. We must help these Americans. We must help those seniors who face the housing crunch by providing the additional \$130 million for section 202 elderly housing loans—a program that has been cut over 50 percent since 1981.

The passage of this amendment will ensure additional funding for asbestos removal efforts in schools. The EPA estimates that over 15 million children and 1.5 million employees are exposed to this health hazard in over 44,000 school buildings. Congress has demonstrated its support for reducing the health threat posed by asbestos by requiring schools to inspect and remove asbestos from buildings and by providing loans and grants to schools for these abatement efforts. However, the level of funding provided by Congress over the years has been inadequate. EPA estimates that it will cost over \$3.1 billion for schools to comply with Federal asbestos inspection, management, and removal requirements. Only 17 percent of the funds requested by schools have been provided, and among those schools with the worst health risks, only 43 percent have been funded.

Mr. Chairman, what the Schumer amendment injects into this debate is a big dose of reality. Some national policymakers apparently think that the budget can create money out of thin air. Maybe there is a NASA or NSF Program that is planned to do that, but the space station does not do that. It does not create money out of thin air, that type of alchemy doesn't exist today and isn't likely in the future.

Where is the payment component of the space station program, the balance for this unbalanced equation? I would appeal to my colleagues and ask, where is the \$30 billion to fund this program?

We must deal with all our commitments. We must stand up for people who do not have a multimedia advertising blitz with all the glitz. In the past 8 years the U.S. Government has tripled its deficit because our hunger for many new high-cost programs has not been tempered by the reality of the cost. That is the balance. If the American public wants to support these programs and they are willing to go ahead, then we should go to them and ask them to pay for them, and if they do support them, then we can march forward.

Apparently the attitude here is—just keep adding on to the deficit, or worse yet, let us take from the neediest of the needy. Today we have 13.5 percent

of the U.S. population living below the poverty level. It has gone up by 7 million or 8 million people in the last 8 years and yet the National Government is taking from programs that serve the poorest of the poor.

□ 1320

Mr. Chairman, this is robbing from Peter to pay Paul, and we should not do it. We have to address this matter in a rational way.

In the 1960's the National Government was able to balance the budget. That is why we were able to do the things we did in the 1960's, and we did not have to take from needed programs to fund the new initiatives. Disregarding past commitments is the wrong way to approach the funding of the space program. This is a good program, and there are a lot of good programs, but we have to pick and choose, and we have to make decisions, and we have to pay as we go.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER]. His amendment will destroy the very inventions and technologies that increase the quality of life for those very people he feels so deeply about.

Let's take a minute to look at what the space station really means for America. I'm sure the gentleman from New York will be pleasantly surprised to learn that many of the principles and ideals he speaks of can be found in the space station program.

Proponents of the amendment speak of the need for increased medical care for veterans—a very admirable program. But, did you know that life sciences research aboard Space Station Freedom will have many health care benefits here on Earth? For example, space research to control bone-calcium loss may lead to a cure for osteoporosis. Space research on white blood cell behavior may help lead to a cure for cancer. Further, previous NASA space programs have provided medical advances such as insulin infusion pumps, reading machines for the blind, ocular screening systems to detect eye problems in children, and laser heart surgery. Obviously, medical care in general has benefited significantly from the space programs in the past and will continue to prosper under the space station program.

Proponents of the amendment also speak of adding money to perform research on global warming and other environmental projects. If these Members are really serious about our environment, they would be more than willing to support funding for the space station. Let's look at the facts. Space Station Freedom is a permanent

observatory for Earth sciences. Environmental scientists will be able to continually view and study Earth from a new perspective and characterize change over the next 30 years. Earth observations from the space station contribute to "Mission to Planet Earth," providing a better understanding of our ecological system, leading to solutions for environmental problems such as air and water pollution, deforestation, greenhouse effect, ozone depletion, and waste and resource management.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I feel it is important to put in perspective just where these funds will ultimately fall. They will fall on precisely the people the gentleman from New York wishes to help. The space station means increased medical care through medical advancements. The space station means increased environmental protection through extensive research in our planet. The space station, with its 50,000 jobs directly associated with the development and construction of the program, and, countless jobs associated with spinoff technology, means greater national pride and fewer Americans that will require public support for basic needs like food and housing.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON], who is the chairman of NASA's authorizing subcommittee.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], and it is tough to say what I want to say in 1 minute, but I will try.

Mr. Chairman, if this Nation ever stops its space program, we would turn inward, and we would become a second-rate nation. We never want to do that. It is part of the character of this country and our people that we are always expanding out, that we are explorers, that we are adventurers.

Mr. Chairman, today the President has laid out a plan. We need his help desperately, more than he said this morning, in helping to fund that plan, but an integral part of that plan is this space station. We need to fund it, and we need to beat badly the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] on a vote of 2 to 1 like we did last time last year.

In conclusion I would just say that the Scriptures say that where the people have no vision, then surely the people will perish. That is not for this Nation. We need the vision.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], who, even though he is opposed to the amendment, has such wisdom that I am yielding to him.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] for yielding

me this time, though I do regret that he offers the amendment again like he did before. I say to the gentleman, "I would recommend that, if you want to look for places to save money, look in the big budgets. Look at the Defense Department. They've got \$296 billion. I don't know if they can even count that high. Lord knows they don't know where it all goes."

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this is a minor budget, but it is essential, and I rise, 20 years to the day after America first landed on the Moon, to voice my strong opposition to the amendment. The time has come to put a stop to this yearly tug of war. Anyone who cares to examine my record in Congress knows of my strong support for our Nation's veterans and for the HUD program. These are important commitments which deserve our strong support. But we made an equally important commitment over 30 years ago when we decided as a nation to strive for world leadership in the exploration of our last great frontier, space. Our Space Program has endured through many a scientific and technological setback, and through many a tough budgetary battle. Men and women have sacrificed their lives in an attempt to further our understanding of the vast benefits of space exploration and research.

The next step on this road is the establishment of a permanently manned space station. Many years of research, and many dollars, over \$900 million last year alone, have been spent to insure that the space station becomes a reality. We have watched as the Soviet Union reaps the innumerable scientific benefits already being enjoyed as a result of their currently orbiting station.

Funding for the space station has already been cut by almost \$400 million from the original request, and virtually all agree that the current amount debated and agreed to by both the subcommittee and full committee, is the bare minimum necessary to keep the Space Station Program alive. Passage of this amendment would surely sound the death knell for this program. I strongly urge my colleagues not to shirk this body's longstanding commitment to space and vote against this amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise on my birthday and, incidentally, also on the 20th anniversary of Apollo XI in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Neil Armstrong's "one giant leap for mankind" proved that humanity does not live on only one Earth. We live in a solar system with nine planets, over 30 moons, thousands of asteroids, a billion comets, and an

energy source that will last for at least 2 billion more years. Development of these resources would do more to bring planetwide prosperity and protect Earth's environment than any other endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, there are still those who say, and I believe that it is being indicated in this amendment, "How can we spend money on space when there are so many problems still on Earth?" The benefits of the Space Program are so immense that no one person could list them all. Other than the obvious, such as weather satellites and the ability of our constituents to watch us here on C-Span, there are the industrial and medical improvements and developments that touch everybody's everyday life: fireproof clothing, improvement of automobile brakes, industrial and medical advances, and these have been spurred by the space program.

However, Mr. Chairman, these are just a fraction of the potential that space development holds for the people of the world. This cannot happen unless we make the necessary investment now.

As we recall the triumphs of the past, we must prepare for the needs of the future. America must build this space station, explore the solar system, and we must return to the Moon.

On this heroic anniversary we must remember that, if America is to remain a great nation, it must remain a leader in space.

I support all the excellent programs supported by the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], but our attitude cannot be either/or. It must be both/and. Space definitely must be included.

□ 1330

The CHAIRMAN. On behalf of all the membership, the Chair wishes the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] a happy birthday.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a most distinguished member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, since I understand that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] is pressed for time, I also yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is recognized for a total of 2 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank both gentlemen for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from New York. Ordinarily I would vote for this amendment because on its face the amendment appears to establish priorities between America's space program and many of our press-

ing domestic programs. I do not know of anyone in this Chamber who has cried out longer or more vociferously than I have for this Nation to establish priorities. If I thought that this amendment did that I would not be here today opposing this amendment. On balance, I do not think the amendment accomplishes this.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of this subcommittee I sponsored an amendment to this bill which also establishes priorities. That amendment establishes bill language that at least 10 percent of station funds be allocated for women- and minority-owned businesses. The reason for this language is that the development, construction, and operation of the space station is one of the most ambitious economic projects ever undertaken by our Nation. It will address economic development and jobs in an unprecedented manner right here on Earth. More specifically it will substantively address the fact that in 1987, less than 1 percent of space station contracts were awarded to women-owned businesses and only approximately 3 percent of space station contracts were awarded to minority-owned businesses in 1989.

Mr. Chairman, traditionally minority-owned firms have not been involved with projects of this magnitude. Consequently, our Nation faces a situation constituting de facto exclusion of qualified contractors from such projects. By including this bill language that at least 10 percent of station funds be allocated for women- and minority-owned businesses, NASA will be able to enhance and guarantee minority involvement in the scientific and technological industries which will be such an integral part of this Nation as we move into the 21st century. This is extremely important as we move into the next century with the knowledge that in the year 2000 the majority of the new entrants into the work force will be minorities. In fact, we know now that by the year 2020 that one-third of the Nation's work force will be minorities.

Mr. Chairman, as I look at today's priorities I see the appropriation of funds for the space station to be vital in eradicating joblessness, poverty, poor housing, inadequate health care, and other pressing domestic problems. I see these space station funds as vital in enabling us to produce the economic development that can eradicate these domestic ills.

I urge you to defeat the Schumer amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE], a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment of-

fered by the gentleman from New York, in support of the amendment because the arguments that we have heard here today talk about our concern for the development of the space station, but yet I am concerned that so many speak of it without some concern for those people who live in this space which we occupy, this space called Earth. It seems to me there must be a concern about setting some priorities. Our priorities today would seem to suggest that we are indeed concerned about our relationships in space, are concerned about the development of space and technology, our role in that as a nation, as the leading nation in it; yet it seems to me that there must also be a concern that this amendment does not say that we will not have a space station. What it does say is that we will cut. We will cut so that we might be able to assure those veterans who rallied behind the flag to fight for democracy for this Nation and other nations, that they will be able to have the benefit of living in good and clean and usable space in this Nation.

Also to say to the senior citizens who deserve the right to live in dignity at this stage of their lives that their space will be a space that will not be dilapidated, and to those persons who continue to live every day as a part of the homeless, as a part of the hungry, that we are concerned about your space here on Earth as much as we are concerned about space on Mars and other places.

Mr. Chairman, let us support this amendment. Let us pass it so that we might be able to do all these things so that our minds, our hearts, and our heads may be satisfied.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FLIPPO].

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. The amendment offered by my distinguished colleague devastate the very centerpiece of NASA's future endeavors in space exploration, the space station "Freedom".

While I support the programs that this amendment seeks to increase funding for—housing programs, veterans programs, and the Environmental Protection Agency, the fact is that these programs have received substantial increases in funding under the bill before us today.

I believe Mr. TRAXLER and the members of the committee have done an outstanding job in assuring that all of the programs in the VA-HUD and independent agencies bill receive the funding they need to carry out their missions.

I believe it is shortsighted to put an end to a program like space station, which holds such vast potential for

the betterment of mankind, in order to provide what amounts to only a month or two of additional funding for housing programs.

It is ironic that we are debating this amendment on the anniversary of America's greatest achievement in space, the landing of the first man on the Moon.

In his message to Congress outlining his proposal to beat the Soviets in a race to the moon, President Kennedy said:

\*\*\* Now is the time to take longer strides—time for a great new American enterprise—time for this great nation to take a clearly leading role in space achievement, which in many ways may hold the key to our future on earth.

The space station Freedom is our Nation's next great achievement in space and one which holds even greater promise for the future of every nation through medical and scientific breakthroughs that some believe can only come in the environment of space.

I urge my colleagues to once again take up the challenge John Kennedy made to this Nation in 1961, but did not live to see achieved on this very day in 1969.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Schumer amendment so that we can through NASA push back the frontiers of space for all mankind.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Schumer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to pushing us to the outer limits of discovery, the space program generates a well-spring of technology. Every day, this technology improves the life of yet another American here on Earth as we find yet a new and different application for it. For this reason, I would argue that a vote for the space station Freedom is also in fact a vote for veterans, the sick, the homeless, and the environment.

Before you cast your vote against the space station because you think that research on asbestos and global warming is a far more pressing need, I urge you consider how many times in how many different ways aerospace technology has contributed essentially to our knowledge of the environment. Over the past 15 years, environmental researchers at NASA have been looking at processes occurring in nature as a cost-effective way of controlling pollution both on Earth and in space. We have already achieved very promising results with indoor air pollution and wastewater treatment using NASA technology. Today, NASA researchers are contributing steadily to our knowledge of landfill leachate treatment, hazardous waste disposal, tropical rainforests, and ground water pollution. The scanning instruments aboard NASA satellites give us a total picture of the forest damage from acid rain. Technology developed in the space pro-

gram also gave us the means to discover the stratospheric ozone hole.

And before you vote to kill the space station because you think that another housing program would give the American taxpayer more for his dollar, I urge you to consider the countless numbers of sick and homeless helped by NASA's experimental work. Just a few outstanding examples of space-pioneered medical technology include: A cardiac pacemaker that can be automatically recharged without surgery, a human tissue stimulator that relieves chronic pain, anticontamination hospital garments, x rays that can penetrate bone and produce pictures of body tissues and organs, a means of automatically correcting the heart's inability to pump blood, a self-injury inhibitor for the autistic and retarded, an automatic insulin delivery system for diabetics, a wearable computerized system that allows doctors to monitor ambulatory patients with coronary artery disease, a filtering system for removing impurities from blood, and a means of warming newborn premature babies without noise or burn hazard.

Finally, I urge my colleagues to remember that an investment in NASA and the space station Freedom is also an investment in the health of the American economy. In today's world, if our industries can't offer what the rest of the world wants because of weaknesses in technology, our standard of living is likely to fall. Because American industry benefits directly from NASA spinoff technology, our support of the space program indirectly improves the life of every U.S. citizen.

I urge my colleagues to remember that exactly 20 years ago, America's lunar module, Eagle, landed on the Moon. This event marked a major milestone in the history of civilization and will live forever in the memories of millions of people around the globe.

In short, Mr. Chairman, a vote to preserve the space station is a vote to move ahead with the future—a vote for another giant leap for mankind—rather than to preserve the status quo.

Today President George Bush called for a permanent colony on the Moon and manned exploration of Mars.

My colleagues, we cannot make new discoveries on Mars, if we will not leave the Earth. Join with me and defeat the Schumer amendment and lead America into the 21st century of space discovery—discovery that will benefit all mankind.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion of my segment of the debate, I should simply like again to point out the fact that this amendment, as drafted, as approved by the Rules Committee, is a general cut of \$714 million from the NASA research and development account, of which the space station is less than a third.

NASA, as this amendment is drafted, would be free to apply that cut anywhere it chose, including some of the most environmentally important programs that NASA has, programs which are critical to Mission to Planet Earth.

If it is applied against the station program, I want to assure my colleagues that in the long run that is going to drive the cost of the space station through the roof.

It is a stupid way to procure the Space Station to go this route. You would be better off to kill it and start over some year.

Do not support this halfway measure that in the end is going to drive up costs and leave us still less money in future years to fund programs for the veterans, the homeless, and the environment. Vote against the amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion that it is better for the environment to do more research as an offshoot of the space station than in fact to spend money on the environment is silly. No one believes it, so there is no point in dwelling on it. No one believes that if your priority is doing environmental improvement that you would forebear trying to work on the environment today so that you would learn more about how to do it 10 years from now.

Beyond that, we are told, well, this is for all mankind to take a step forward. No, it is not. It is for those of us who are well off to take a step forward. It is for those of us who live comfortably to take a step forward, but for those among us who are veterans in need of medical care, poor and working people and older people who are ill-housed or spending too much for housing, it is a pushback for them.

Let us not pretend that there is some equality about this. Yes, it would be nice to go forward in space. We have veterans in our medical hospitals desperately in need of nursing care. We have people who are starving themselves slowly because the alternative would be to go homeless, and we are saying to this very wealthy Nation, let us take care of some of those basic needs first.

There are Members here who have paid a lot of lipservice and will continue to do it to people worried about veterans' care, who are worried about the environment, and who are worried about housing.

□ 1340

This is one of those rare chances to put our money where our mouth is, and those who vote no on the amendment, as they have a right to do, ought to at least forbear in the future from telling the veterans and the ill-housed and those who care about the environment how deeply they are concerned.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the notion is that somehow if we do not give this money to the space station that it is a dream deferred. I think the fact of the matter is that if we do not adopt this amendment we are asking millions of Americans to have their dreams deferred. We are asking them to defer their health care, to defer their housing, to defer the safety of their schools.

This Congress has said time and again that it is our obligation and the necessity to clean up the schools from the asbestos hazard, and all of us have listened to school districts who have told us that they have to close classrooms and close schools until this problem is taken care.

Instead of taking care of that problem, we are going to send this money to space. That is unacceptable. We should be going to space. We should be building the space station. But let space lead the way in an economic conversion. Let them lead the way in an economic conversion from the military spending to space exploration, to space R&D, to the buildup of the vehicles that are needed. Do not let it be subsidized on the backs of people who need the basic necessities, the basic medical care, the basic housing in everyday American life.

If this is a program that we embrace as a nation, let us have the courage to embrace it with the revenues. The President today is asking us to embrace it, but he will not tell anybody how he wants to pay for it. This is how he wants to pay for it. He wants the elderly, he wants the veterans, he wants the children of this Nation to pay for it rather than having the courage of his convictions, rather than leading an economic conversion away from the B-2 to the lunar module to the exploration vehicles. He says no. Make the veterans pay for it, pay for it with their health care, with their housing. It is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, we should adopt the Schumer amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of argument today, but there is a bottom line here. The bottom line is we must draw priorities.

Mr. Chairman, going to space is nice. It is even important. The space station is not the way to go to space. It is the B-2 bomber of the Space Program. Leading scientists and the President's own advisers say that it is not necessary.

What are we doing if we get the space station? What harm are we doing? What good does the space station do to a veteran in a hospital who cannot get health care? What good does the space station do to a child doubled up in a classroom because his

classrooms has asbestos in it? What good does the space station do to a young family trying to buy a home and unable to do it?

Mr. Chairman, do my colleagues want to keep America No. 1? Do they want to be proud? Do they want to lead the way?

Mr. Chairman, every country in this world will tell us that if we do not educate our youth, care for the health of our people, and clean up our environment, no matter what we do in space, we are going to be a second-rate power.

Let us look at the real problems we have. Let us explore space, but not with gold plating, not with things that we really do not need. Let us explore it in a rational, careful way and let us look to the real priorities this Nation has to keep us No. 1: our people.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from New York.

I can agree with the causes which he champions and the legitimacy of his attempt to fund those causes by the amending route. But, in my mind, this amendment is misplaced. Both the authorizing and appropriating committees have looked at competing causes and they have concluded that the space station deserves this funding. While other causes are meritorious, they should be considered on those merits, and not jumbled together in an emotional raid on the space station. This amendment reminds me of the notorious bank robber who, when asked why he robbed banks, explained, "because that's where the money's at."

But the basic reason for my opposition is my fundamental belief that this backdoor burglary robs our country's space destiny.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, just 20 years ago today, as Apollo 11 landed, Members of Congress stood in this very Chamber, proud to be Americans. Proud as they watched Neil Armstrong raise our flag, achieving our goal of putting the first man on the Moon.

But today, as we consider how we will fund our space program, Congressman CHARLES SCHUMER of New York offers an amendment that will make those proud achievements of our space program just a thing of the past.

What we are voting on today is not whether we, as a nation, should spend more money on the homeless, on veterans, or to protect our environment. No, today we are voting on whether we will kill the space program.

In 1984, we made a national commitment to build a space station which would establish a U.S.-manned presence in Earth's orbit. We committed to build a research facility that would act as a platform for Earth-viewing instruments, a lab for life science and materials

research, and a staging area for the future exploration of the solar system.

Furthermore, we made a commitment to our international partners to build the space station in unison for the benefit of the whole world. Was that commitment just a passing fancy? I think not. I believe we have an obligation to renew our preeminence in space.

Today President Bush, intent on reasserting that preeminence, announced that he will commission a study of feasible goals for the U.S. Space Program. The President told us he wants to see this country once again establish itself as a pioneer in space, venturing to the Moon and Mars. However, he recognized that we will never get to the Moon or to Mars if we do not deploy the space station. President Bush called for a fully operational space station by the turn of the century. The station is the critical building block for all our future aspirations in space.

Let me be clear that I, too, believe that housing, veterans' medical care, and the environment are priorities. That's why I wrote a letter to Chairman WHITTEN expressing my concern that all the interests in the Veterans' Affairs-Housing and Urban Development [HUD]-independent agencies appropriations bill be given utmost priority in the budget process. All of the agencies in Chairman TRAXLER's jurisdiction—the Veterans' Administration, HUD, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and various independent agencies including the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Science Foundation—are feeling the pinch of our budget dilemma. And all have equal significance to our Nation's future. In that letter, which Congressman SCHUMER himself signed, I felt that those of us with varying interests had come together in a coalition to protect each of the programs. Today I find this was sadly not the case. Today we pit one group against another.

Indeed I would have liked to have seen a stronger NASA budget come out of the Congress this year. The administration and NASA made a compelling case that \$2.1 billion was needed to keep the current configuration of the station on track. After it became clear that because of competing priorities the space station would only receive \$1.65 billion, NASA went back to the drawing board. Today NASA issued a statement that any further cuts would mean complete cancellation of the station. While I accept the fact that the space station will not receive NASA's original request, because I believe in keeping the coalition intact, I will not accept a move to destroy our space program.

Yet our space program is in jeopardy. As we speak the Soviet space station circles above us, as it has every single day since February 20, 1986. And since that time a Soviet crew has spent more than a year in space, setting the record for continuous manned flight.

Certainly we should not forget President Kennedy's words,

The exploration of space will go ahead whether we join in it or not, and it is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space.

Today let us not forget that the Apollo spirit which we are celebrating was the spirit of conquering the impossible. Once again, we face a crossroads. It is my hope that we will have the courage to choose the course of continuing this pioneering spirit which has been the inspiration of our youth and our country. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Schumer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Schumer amendment to reprogram funds away from the space station Freedom.

The space station represents the cutting edge of the American space program today. In order to reclaim our position has a world leader in this area, we must fully fund this important program. The Schumer amendment, in cutting space station funding by \$714 million, would kill the program.

Why do I support the space station so strongly? Because it is good for America and good for the world. The space station is sorely needed to reassert American presence in the arena of space. The space program has consistently provided America and the world with a myriad of scientific advances. The space station, in serving as a national laboratory in space, will make possible important research in the areas of pharmaceuticals, metallurgy, and robotics, among others.

My distinguished colleague from New York seeks to reprogram space station funds to some very worthy programs, including medical care for veterans and various housing programs. I must point out to the gentleman, however, that VA medical care is fully funded at \$11.56 billion in this bill. Also, HUD receives a \$500-million increase in the bill. In contrast, the space station has already received cuts of \$450 million during the budget process for fiscal year 1990. We do not have to kill the space station to fund these very worth-while programs.

The space station has important security applications as well. The Soviet Union continues to improve their already advanced space program. We have put one space station, Skylab, in orbit—the Soviets have put up three. Their latest effort, the space station Mir, is circling the Earth as we speak. Who knows what kind of experiments the Soviets are performing up there? Who knows what kinds of scientific advances they are making in the Mir space station? The Soviets already have the longevity record in space by a huge margin. Are we simply going to continue to allow the Soviet Union to be unchallenged in this vital area? Or are we going to show the determination that the Soviets have shown in making their space program No. 1?

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on the Schumer amendment.

A no vote on this amendment says yes to the space station Freedom and yes to renewed American leadership in space.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSTAMANTE].

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Schumer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today on the 20th anniversary of the Apollo lunar landing, to urge my colleagues to take yet another step forward for our country by approving the full appropriation for the space station Freedom. Space station Freedom promises to establish this country as a leader in scientific and technological competitiveness. It will enable immediate research in electronics, composite metals and pharmaceuticals, plus provide an environment for continual experimentation which could lead to cures for critical health problems.

It is most hopeful, though, that our children will benefit from the continuation of a strong space program. It is hoped that as our children share the benefits and observe the advancements from space experiments their interest in science and technology will grow and they will pursue these fields for their and this country's advancement. The future of our country lies in their vision of importance, and few things are of such importance as exploring a new frontier.

Twenty-seven years ago John Kennedy cautioned us about the relationship between the future of our country and the support of a strong space program, that was still in its infancy. He said:

Surely, the opening vistas of space promise high costs and hardships, as well as high reward. So it is not surprising that some would have us stay where we are a little longer to rest, to wait.

He warned us that:

If history teaches us anything, it is that man, in his quest for knowledge and progress, is determined and cannot be deterred. The exploration of space will go ahead, whether we join in it or not. \* \* \*

Today we are being challenged to stay in the race. I urge my colleagues to vote against efforts to reduce funding for the space station and let us continue moving ahead to explore the vistas that await us.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN].

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Schumer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, today marks the 20th anniversary of man's first steps on the Moon. A day that we all remember and a day I will never forget. Twenty years ago I was never prouder to be an American.

You can be assured that a vote for the Schumer amendment will shatter any future dreams in space and will devastate America's ability to compete for the technological advances of tomorrow.

Let there be no mistake that the technological advances of tomorrow will come from space. For example, Ariospace, the French equivalent of NASA, now controls more than 50 percent of the world's commercial satellite launching business.

What worries me is that we as a nation are not worried. There must be a national sense

that the space station will be a major mechanism for reaching our goal of establishing man as a builder and permanent worker in space. In addition, the economic and scientific windfall to our Nation can not be ignored. It is interesting to note that the Apollo mission yielded a 7-to-1 return of every dollar invested.

Space exploration not only drives the economy over the long term, but is the best investment for our future because it sharpens the skills and harnesses the talents of all Americans involved.

Other countries recognize that the jobs and products of the future will come from space exploration. So should we.

I encourage all Members to vote against the Schumer amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Schumer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Schumer amendment. This amendment which would cut \$714 million from the space station Freedom Program, if passed, would effectively kill the prospects of a U.S. space station.

The space station is the first step of a rejuvenated national space program that will regain U.S. leadership in space. The establishment of the space station will send a message to the Nation that the United States will continue being a leader in space research and exploration. This commitment to the space station will lead to a critical and necessary revitalization of science and engineering education in the United States. It will provide a centerpiece for international cooperation in space. Together with increased emphasis on the commercialization of space, space station Freedom will contribute toward a favorable trade balance.

Space station Freedom functioning as a permanently manned national space center will enable critical space science research and technology not possible on Earth. For example, basic physics research on Earth has always been affected by the Earth's gravitational pull and hindered by the inability to accurately measure the influence of gravitational effects. In the weightless environment of the space station, man will continuously be able to perform basic physics research isolated from the effects of gravity. The microgravity space environment will enable materials research leading to the development of the next generation of super computers as well as new discoveries in superconductors and pharmaceuticals. The research and production of new pharmaceuticals is a very exciting field for it will enable us to work toward cures for diseases which we have not been able to develop here on Earth because of the gravitation pull. Medical research and development alone constitutes hope for the diabetes victims—and we might—we just might—find that elusive cure for cancer through the exploration of space.

Our Nation must continue moving forward with the permanently manned space station Freedom. The Soviet permanently manned space station MIR is presently operating, with the Europeans developing plans to establish their own permanently manned national space

center. The United States must continue working to establish our own space station in order to sit at the table of world space leaders in the next century.

Space station Freedom will proclaim to the world that the United States has returned to a space leadership role, instilling national pride and prestige in all Americans similar to the pride felt when Neil Armstrong became the first man to walk on the Moon.

Today we celebrate the 20th anniversary of the landing of Apollo 11 on the Moon. Today, Americans are proud of the United States' space program. We must give them a program in which to display their pride in the future. I urge my colleagues to show their pride in our space program by defeating the Schumer amendment and allowing the continued development of space station Freedom.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SARPALIUS].

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Schumer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems almost inconceivable to me that on the 20th anniversary of the greatest technological achievement in the history of mankind we actually would be debating the worth of the space station. I would have thought everyone understood that worth by now.

Space exploration and the trip to the Moon yielded far more for this Nation than the simple thrill we all felt two decades ago when Neil Armstrong first set foot on the Moon. The technology we created for our space program has gone on to revolutionize our everyday lives and the work of this House.

All of us have computers in our office. They make our work more efficient. They enable us to communicate quickly with our constituents. They help us organize every aspect of our operations. We all take these fabulous machines for granted, but few of us think of how they came to be.

The answer is simple—space exploration. NASA needed high-speed computers for its complex missions. And, they needed computers compact enough to fit inside a spaceship. These needs led to the creation of computers driven by microchips instead of vacuum tubes, powerful computers that could fit on a desktop instead of a warehouse.

Consider another example: satellite communication. Every word we say on the floor of this House is recorded by a television camera and beamed by satellite to cable systems across the United States. When I was born, this kind of technology was the stuff of science fiction. Today, we take it for granted. Every time one of us books a satellite feed-back to a local station in our district, we should say a silent prayer of thanks to our space program.

The list of benefits from space could go on and on. Tremendous medical research has been done in space. We understand so much more about our environment and the way it works because of studies we've conducted in space. We've saved countless thousands of lives because weather satellites have enabled

us to warn people in advance that severe weather is on the way.

Our space station will be no different from the space programs that have gone before it. It will yield phenomenal technological and scientific advances. In fact, I will go on record today as predicting the benefits of the space station will outstrip those of its predecessors for one simple reason. The space station will be dedicated almost entirely to research, to increasing human knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, by any objective measure, this nation's space program has been an overwhelming success. The space station is the next logical step forward. Thirty years ago, we left our Earth and ventured into space. Twenty years ago, we left the bonds of Earth orbit and went to the Moon. We committed ourselves to the exploration of space. We've gone too far to turn back now.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Schumer amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I join in the big majority of our colleagues in opposing the Schumer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Schumer amendment to cut the Space Station Freedom Program by \$714 million and transfer those funds to other programs in the bill. I oppose this amendment because of my strong support for the Space Station Program.

I agree with Representative SCHUMER on the importance of programs such as veteran's medical care, housing for the elderly, homeless assistance, and environmental programs. However, these programs have been responsibly addressed by the committee in this bill and should not be further bolstered at the expense of the space station.

In a statement made yesterday, NASA reported that "past funding constraints have already delayed the deployment of the space station more than 2 years, and the prospect of additional congressional funding limitations jeopardizes continuation of the program." I believe that the Schumer amendment would virtually kill the space station by slowing it to a snail's pace and would eliminate the leadership of the United States in space technology and exploration.

As you will recall, this body overwhelmingly voted to approve the full budget request for the Space Station Freedom Program last Congress. It is also important to note that we successfully defeated a similar amendment offered by Representative SCHUMER last year by a vote of 166 to 256.

On this 20th anniversary of America's successful landing on the Moon, I believe it would be a travesty to cripple this country's opportunity for future manned space exploration. I urge my colleagues to consider the consequences of their vote on this important issue and ask you to vote against the Schumer amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Schumer amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McMILLEN].

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Schumer amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute, the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, around this globe people debate whether or not this generation of Americans has the vision of our ancestors. Indeed, they debate whether or not America is an ascending or a declining nation.

Today we face that question in the same terms as every other generation of Americans. Are we prepared to invest in the future? Do we understand that science is the basis of our economic hope? Do we understand that our goals, our common goals to feed the hungry, house the homeless, will never be met borrowing from the future?

They are the product of economic growth, and only by wealth created by investing and learning will we ever meet those common objectives.

Mr. Chairman, every generation of Americans has understood that choice. Answer affirmatively for our time. Our culture, our heritage as Americans demands that we do no less.

Defeat the Schumer amendment. Send the message on this 20th anniversary of America's greatest triumph that America is still young, still bold, with her eyes still fixed on the future.

Vote "no."

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Schumer amendment to H.R. 2916, the VA-HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill. The Schumer amendment would transfer \$714 million from the space station to other worthwhile but underfunded programs for veterans, for pollution control and for housing.

Today, on the 20th anniversary of the Moon landing, we can take pride in the history and accomplishments of the American space program. I think we can all agree that space exploration and the research and development which underlie it contribute to our lives. I support a continuation of funding for the exploration of space.

Yet, today, as the President announces the initial stages of planning for a space flight to Mars by the year 2010, I believe we must take a serious and soul-searching look at the state of our domestic programs. Funding for the space station will accomplish little if it is at the expense of meeting our citizens' basic needs. We can look up at the Moon and take pride in the fact that we have succeeded in visiting it. But what do we say to the children who visit our Nation's Capital, look around them and

see homeless men, women, and children living on The Mall and picking through the trash to find food to eat? What do we say to the children whose parents are struggling to keep roofs over their heads?

I support the Schumer amendment because I believe that we must, we absolutely must, make meeting our many serious domestic needs a priority. Since 1980, the money spent by this Nation on subsidized housing has decreased from \$26.6 billion to \$7.4 billion in fiscal year 1989. Proposed funding for the space station has been increased by 84 percent in this appropriations bill—bringing the amount to \$1.65 billion for the space station alone. That amount is equal to over one-seventh of the total amount spent on subsidized housing. Where are our priorities? Where is that money really best spent—to meet the dreams of a handful of scientists striving for a project in space or to meet the needs and to give dreams to thousands of low-income people, to veterans, and to the elderly across the Nation?

The space station project will continue with or without this proposed transfer of funds away from it. Can we say the same thing about the lives of the individuals who may find themselves homeless due to lack of funds? I urge my colleagues to support the Schumer amendment.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Today, we celebrate the 20th anniversary of the historic Moon landing. This was a challenge set by John F. Kennedy. The inspiration of John Kennedy's goal gave spirit to all Americans during a troubled decade. Some people may find it ironic that anniversary could be marked with passage of this amendment. Well, it may seem ironic, but it is not wrong.

John Kennedy taught us about other priorities on this planet, and for our own people. We must try to fix the broken parts of this planet before we start venturing to others.

Before we reach for Mars, or build a space station, we must try to help the Americans living in tragedy. The senior citizen in New York who can't afford a decent meal. The family in Chicago which has to live in a homeless shelter. The children who are poisoned by asbestos—because the Philadelphia schools cannot pay to restore the buildings. The Vietnam vet in Texas who receives inadequate medical care.

These are the priorities that America needs to focus on, the priorities that this amendment restores. Let's go into space. Let's keep on the cutting edge of technological brilliance.

But as we gaze into the heavens, let's take a look down America's streets—and focus on the real needs of our people.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. SCHUMER's amendment to the Veterans Affairs, HUD, independent agencies appropriations bill.

Mr. SCHUMER's amendment would allow NASA a 4.5-percent increase over last year's budget and transfer \$714 million to veterans' medical services, EPA pollution control and research, including asbestos in schools, and to low-income housing programs.

NASA has received continuous increases while low-income housing programs have been reduced by over 80 percent in the last 8 years. There are 3.5 million elderly living in poverty. Only 16 percent of those elderly live in subsidized housing.

In light of the HUD scandals where millions of dollars were diverted from the needy poor to the unscrupulous consultants, section 202 is a model program. Servicing only the very low income, it has a 30-year history of only one default. It is one of only two new construction programs still funded since the Reagan era. The housing starts in this program dropped 58 percent in the first 5 years of the Reagan era and have been steadily reduced since then.

These programs are vital to our future and need to be a priority.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, the Space Station Program has already been sharply reduced by \$400 million during markup of the bill, severely stretching NASA's capacity to retain it as a viable program. If the Schumer amendment were to go into effect, the space station program would effectively be killed.

The space station, as the cornerstone of the U.S. Space Program is the critical element in maintaining U.S. leadership in space technology and exploration. As currently requested by the administration and Congress, Space Station Freedom will be used as a national laboratory in space that will allow basic research and production of new pharmaceuticals, and a variety of materials and processes that will advance metallurgy, optics, automation and robotics, medical research leading to cures for fatal diseases, and basic scientific advances that will substantially impact the United States competitiveness in the world. Beyond that, the space station is the staging center that will be used for future manned exploration of our solar system including a possible return to the Moon for long duration activity and a manned mission to Mars.

Space Station Freedom has been approved and endorsed by two administrations, Congress, and many scientific groups including the National Research Council. Congress last year overwhelmingly approved the authorization and full budget request for the Space Station Freedom Program. With nearly \$2 billion currently invested in the program, the Government and industry teams are assembled and have already proceeded with the development hardware phase of the program.

Mr. Chairman, it is ironic that an amendment to kill the space station would occur on the 20th anniversary of America's successful landing on the Moon. The death of Space Station Freedom would mark the end of America's quest for civilian preeminence and competitiveness in space technology and exploration. It is with this in mind that you are urged to oppose the Schumer amendment to the fiscal year 1990 VA-HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my opposition to the Schumer amendment to cut \$714 million from the NASA research and development account.

The development, construction, and operation of a fully equipped, manned space station called "Freedom" is one of the most im-

portant and ambitious projects undertaken by our Nation. We must continue funding for the space station in order to assure the leadership of the free world in space during the 1990's and beyond.

The Schumer amendment essentially would kill the Space Station Program. President Bush, recognizing the overriding importance of the space station, requested \$2 billion for this program in fiscal year 1990. I support the President's efforts to provide the maximum level of funding possible for the space station in the upcoming fiscal year.

However, the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies reduced the development funds for the space station by \$395 million. The subcommittee recognizes that this \$395 million cut may cause a slip in the first element launch of the space station beyond the current date of March 1995. Due to the funding reduction mandated by our current fiscal constraints, NASA will be forced to make sacrifices in the development of the space station. Passage of the Schumer amendment would signal an end to this body's strong commitment to insuring our leadership in space.

I stand firmly behind President Bush's policy of expanding the human presence into the solar system. The United States must remain competitive in space and cannot afford to fail in obtaining the technology and knowledge derived from a strong civilian space program.

No Nation can match our experience in space or our technical capabilities. If we continue to apply these with vision and imagination, and proceed with the development of the space station, then leadership in space will again belong to the United States.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Schumer amendment.

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of an amendment to H.R. 2916 by my colleague Congressman SCHUMER to increase funding for programs that are, or at least should be, top national priorities.

A short time ago this House fought a grueling battle to provide a small amount of money to the Veterans' Administration to keep VA hospitals solvent for the remainder of this fiscal year. But this did not even begin to meet the long-term challenge of restoring veterans' medical care to the high level of quality it enjoyed just a few years ago. In order to accomplish this we in the Congress must provide adequate funding next year and in all the years ahead, not just to maintain current services but to reopen wards, compensate talented staffs, and give veterans back the peace of mind they enjoyed before this recent budget crisis within the VA. By adopting this amendment, we can take another step toward meeting these challenges.

In addition to honoring our veterans, protecting our environment, and providing quality housing to elderly and low-income citizens, many of whom are families with small children should be top national priorities. Decades of polluting our air, our seas and rivers, and our landscape are finally catching up with us. There is a housing crisis in this country that has forced those in both the dawn and twilight of life to suffer either in substandard housing—or to go without any housing at all. This country cannot hope to make progress toward

leading the free world into the 21st century if it cannot commit itself to protecting its all-important environment and helping its most vulnerable citizens acquire the basic necessities of life. By adopting the Schumer amendment we can address these problems without affecting either national security or our place in the forefront of the technological revolution.

Our environment, our homeless and our veterans deserve our best efforts. I urge my colleagues to support the Schumer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 125, noes 291, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

#### AYES—125

Ackerman	Gray	Panetta
Atkins	Hall (OH)	Pelosi
AuCoin	Hamilton	Poshard
Bates	Hawkins	Rahall
Beilenson	Hayes (IL)	Rangel
Bennett	Hertel	Ray
Berman	Hochbrueckner	Rose
Bonior	Hubbard	Roukema
Borski	Jacobs	Rowland (CT)
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Roybal
Brennan	Jontz	Russo
Campbell (CA)	Kanjorski	Salki
Cardin	Kaptur	Sangmeister
Carper	Kastenmeier	Savage
Conte	Kennedy	Sawyer
Conyers	Kildee	Schroeder
Courter	Klecza	Schumer
Crockett	Kostmayer	Shays
DePazio	LaFalce	Sikorski
Dellums	Lehman (CA)	Slaughter (NY)
Donnelly	Lehman (FL)	Smith (FL)
Dorgan (ND)	Levin (MI)	Snowe
Downey	Lewis (GA)	Solarz
Duncan	Lipinski	Staggers
Durbin	Lowey (NY)	Stark
Dymally	Manton	Studds
Early	Markey	Synar
Edwards (CA)	Mavroules	Torres
Evans	McCloskey	Towns
Fish	McHugh	Trafficant
Flake	Mfume	Udall
Florio	Miller (CA)	Unsoeld
Foglietta	Moakley	Vento
Ford (MI)	Moody	Visclosky
Ford (TN)	Morrison (CT)	Weiss
Frank	Murphy	Wheat
Garcia	Neal (MA)	Williams
Gaydos	Oberstar	Wolpe
Gejdenson	Obey	Wyden
Gilman	Olin	Yates
Gonzalez	Owens (NY)	Yatron
Gradison	Owens (UT)	

#### NOES—291

Akaka	Bereuter	Buechner
Alexander	Bevill	Bunning
Anderson	Bilbray	Burton
Andrews	Bilirakis	Bustamante
Annunzio	Bliley	Byron
Anthony	Boehlert	Callahan
Applegate	Boggs	Campbell (CO)
Archer	Bosco	Carr
Armey	Boucher	Chandler
Baker	Brooks	Chapman
Ballenger	Broomfield	Clarke
Barnard	Browder	Clay
Bartlett	Brown (CA)	Clement
Barton	Brown (CO)	Clinger
Bateman	Bruce	Coble
Bentley	Bryant	Coleman (MO)

Coleman (TX)	Kasich	Richardson
Combest	Kennelly	Ridge
Cooper	Kolbe	Rinaldo
Costello	Kolter	Ritter
Coughlin	Kyl	Roberts
Cox	Lagomarsino	Robinson
Coyne	Lancaster	Roe
Craig	Lantos	Rogers
Crane	Laughlin	Rohrabacher
Dannemeyer	Leach (IA)	Roth
Davis	Leland	Rowland (GA)
de la Garza	Lent	Sabo
DeLay	Levine (CA)	Sarpalius
Derrick	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
DeWine	Lewis (FL)	Schaefer
Dickinson	Lightfoot	Scheuer
Dicks	Livingston	Schiff
Dingell	Lloyd	Schneider
Dixon	Long	Schuetz
Dornan (CA)	Lowery (CA)	Schulze
Douglas	Lukens, Donald	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Machtley	Sharp
Dwyer	Madigan	Shaw
Dyson	Marlenee	Shumway
Eckart	Martin (IL)	Shuster
Edwards (OK)	Martinez	Skaggs
Emerson	Matsui	Skeen
English	Mazzoli	Skelton
Erdreich	McCandless	Slattery
Espy	McCollum	Slaughter (VA)
Fawell	McCrery	Smith (IA)
Fazio	McCurdy	Smith (MS)
Feighan	McDade	Smith (NE)
Fields	McDermott	Smith (NJ)
Flippo	McEwen	Smith (TX)
Frenzel	McGrath	Smith (VT)
Frost	McMillan (NC)	Smith, Denny
Galleghy	McMillen (MD)	(OR)
Gallo	McNulty	Smith, Robert
Gekas	Meyers	(NH)
Gephardt	Michel	Smith, Robert
Gibbons	Miller (OH)	(OR)
Gillmor	Miller (WA)	Solomon
Gingrich	Mineta	Spence
Glickman	Mollinari	Spratt
Goodling	Mollohan	Stallings
Gordon	Montgomery	Stangeland
Goss	Moorhead	Stearns
Grandy	Morella	Stenholm
Grant	Morrison (WA)	Stokes
Green	Mrazek	Stump
Guarini	Murtha	Sundquist
Gunderson	Myers	Swift
Hall (TX)	Nagle	Tallon
Hammerschmidt	Natcher	Tanner
Hancock	Neal (NC)	Tauke
Hansen	Nelson	Tauzin
Harris	Nielson	Thomas (CA)
Hastert	Nowak	Thomas (GA)
Hatcher	Oakar	Thomas (WY)
Hayes (LA)	Ortiz	Torricelli
Hefner	Oxley	Traxler
Henry	Packard	Upton
Herger	Pallone	Valentine
Hiler	Parker	Vander Jagt
Hoagland	Parris	Volkmer
Holloway	Pashayan	Vucanovich
Hopkins	Patterson	Walgren
Horton	Paxon	Walker
Houghton	Payne (VA)	Walsh
Hoyer	Pease	Watkins
Huckaby	Penny	Waxman
Hughes	Perkins	Weber
Hunter	Petri	Weldon
Hutto	Pickett	Whittaker
Inhofe	Pickle	Whitten
James	Porter	Wilson
Jenkins	Price	Wise
Johnson (CT)	Pursell	Wolf
Johnston	Quillen	Wylie
Jones (GA)	Regula	Young (AK)
Jones (NC)	Rhodes	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—15

Aspin	Hefley	Martin (NY)
Collins	Hyde	Payne (NJ)
Darden	Ireland	Ravenel
Engel	Leath (TX)	Rostenkowski
Fascell	Luken, Thomas	Sisisky

□ 1406

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Payne of New Jersey for, with Mr. Hefley against.

Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Darden, against.

Messrs. THOMAS of Wyoming, SMITH of New Jersey, and TAUKE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DYMALLY and Mr. CONTE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments en bloc were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 146. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by law, to remain available until September 30, 1991, \$211,000,000, plus reimbursements.

## MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

## OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law, \$48,541,000, plus reimbursements.

## GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 632), for assisting in the replacement and upgrading of equipment and in rehabilitating the physical plant and facilities of the Veterans Memorial Medical Center, \$500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1991.

## DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

## GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed \$7,000 for official reception and representation expenses; cemetery expenses as authorized by law; purchase of six passenger motor vehicles, for use in cemetery operations, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail; \$805,059,000, including \$553,329,000 for the Veterans Benefits Administration; *Provided*, That, during fiscal year 1990, jurisdictional average employment shall not be less than 12,600 for the Veterans Benefits Administration.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$22,249,000.

## CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1004, 1006, 5002,

5003, 5006, 5008, 5009, and 5010 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is \$2,000,000 or more or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, \$417,549,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, except for advance planning of projects funded through the advance planning fund and the design of projects funded through the design fund, none of these funds shall be used for any project which has not been considered and approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: *Provided further*, That funds provided in the appropriation "Construction, major projects" for fiscal year 1990, for each approved project shall be obligated (1) by the awarding of a working drawings contract by September 30, 1990, and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 1991: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall promptly report in writing to the Comptroller General and to the Committees on Appropriations any approved major construction project in which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above; and the Comptroller General shall review the report in accordance with the procedures established by section 1015 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (title X of Public Law 93-344): *Provided further*, That no funds from any other account, except the "Parking garage revolving fund", may be obligated for constructing, altering, extending, or improving a project which was approved in the budget process and funded in this account until one year after substantial completion and beneficial occupancy by the Department of Veterans Affairs of the project or any part thereof with respect to that part only: *Provided further*, That prior to the issuance of a bidding document for any construction contract for a project approved under this heading (excluding completion items), the director of the affected Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility must certify that the design of such project is acceptable from a patient care standpoint.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAXLER

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAXLER: On page 7, line 25, strike out "\$417,549,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$420,249,000".

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds \$2.7 million to the VA's major construction appropriation. Of that amount, \$2.3 million is for the design of a renovation/30-bed spinal cord injury project at the Tampa VA Medical Center. These funds are urgently needed so as to be able to provide additional spinal cord injury treatment for veterans in Florida. As I understand it, this project has the support of the entire Florida delegation.

The balance of the amendment—\$400,000—is for planning of a nursing home care unit to be built at the new VA medical center at Palm Beach. This project will provide much needed

additional nursing home care for veterans in southern Florida.

Both of these projects have been authorized. I would add that the addition of \$2.7 million provided in this amendment will not cause the subcommittee's allocation for budget authority or outlays to be exceeded.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support this amendment.

□ 1410

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of having a colloquy with the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

It is my understanding that the \$400,000 now included in the legislation is for preliminary funding for the completion of the nursing home at the Palm Beach Veterans' Medical Center in Palm Beach, FA, is that correct?

Mr. TRAXLER. If the gentleman will yield, yes, that is correct.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is also my understanding that the gentleman is willing to make the Palm Beach Nursing Home a priority for fiscal year 1991 appropriations, and is willing to work toward its completion with the members of the subcommittee?

Mr. TRAXLER. If the gentleman will further yield, the gentleman is correct. I make that commitment to the gentleman. I will work with the members of the subcommittee to assure that it becomes a reality in the 1991 appropriations bill.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his support of this project, and I also want to tell the gentleman that I think his services are greatly appreciated by the veterans of south Florida, and I am grateful for the gentleman's sensitivity to their concerns and look forward to working with the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I too rise to enter into a very brief colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER.] I would ask the gentleman, is it correct, sir, that your amendment provides \$2.3 million as design funds for the 70-spinal-cord-injury bed renovation and 30-spinal-cord-injury bed additions for the VA Hospital in Tampa, FA, which we are authorized in the VA medical construction resolution?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is totally correct, a most worthwhile project.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his consideration and his open-mindedness. I also, at this time, thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], for his as-

sistance in this matter, and more particularly, the diligent staff out there.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman for his remarks and for his interest in this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and do so to request a colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, this bill purports to fully fund the President's request for the Office of Science and Technology Policy. However, I understand that the President amended his request to increase the budget estimate for OSTP by \$970,000.

Is my understanding correct that the subcommittee did not receive this amendment in time to give it due consideration?

As this bill moves through the process, would the gentleman give every consideration to providing the full amount of the President's request for OSTP, as amended?

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, as always, we are pleased to work with the distinguished member of the subcommittee and the full committee in order to achieve a very desirable result. I regret that the budget amendment for OSTP arrived too late to be considered by the subcommittee. I want to assure the gentleman that we will work diligently to provide the funds as he has mentioned.

I might also say I appreciate the gentleman's support on defeating the motion to cut this bill across the board at a later time so we can have enough money to do all these things.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1004, 1006, 5002, 5003, 5006, 5008, 5009, and 5010 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is less than \$2,000,000, \$113,699,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous "Construction, minor projects" appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is less than \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$44,136,000 shall be available for expenses of the Office of Facilities, including research and development in building construction technology: *Provided further*, That funds in this account shall be available

for (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe, and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes: *Provided further*, That up to \$15,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading may be transferred to and merged with sums appropriated for "General operating expenses".

PARKING GARAGE REVOLVING FUND

For the parking garage revolving fund as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5009), \$29,375,000, together with income from fees collected, to remain available until expended. Resources of this fund shall be available for all expenses authorized by 38 U.S.C. 5009 except operations and maintenance costs which will be funded from "Medical care".

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED  
CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist the several States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify or alter existing hospital, nursing home and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5031-5037), \$42,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE  
VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans cemeteries as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 1008), \$4,356,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Any appropriation for 1990 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", "Veterans insurance and indemnities", and the "Loan guaranty revolving fund" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations.

Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for 1990 for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs (except the appropriations for "Construction, major projects", "Construction, minor projects" and the "Parking garage revolving fund") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 1990 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", "Veterans insurance and indemnities", and the "Loan guaranty revolving fund" shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the aforementioned accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 1989.

Personnel compensation and benefits payments for the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Environmental Protection Agency,

and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the two-week pay period ending September 23, 1989, shall be made by no later than September 29, 1989, and pursuant to section 202(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987, this action is a necessary (but secondary) result of a significant policy change.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. Under rule XXI, clause 2(b), which prohibits legislating in an appropriations bill, with regard to title I, page 12, lines 5 through 13, this contains language which changes existing law. This provision would change the pay dates for employees of the Veterans' Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from October 3, 1989, to September 29, 1989. This would have the effect of moving fiscal year 1990 outlays into fiscal year 1989.

We would object that that is legislation on appropriation.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard on the point of order, I join the distinguished gentleman from California in making the point of order, and my rationale is the same as his. The regular payroll would be made on October 3, under the normal process. The language in question would change that law, cause about \$358 million to be transferred into fiscal year 1989, thereby providing additional outlay moneys in 1990 in that amount, contrary to the budget resolution. I urge the point of order be sustained.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, if I also may be further heard on the point of order, I would like to ask the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Minnesota a question with regard to the point of order, and whether a similar issue would lie when the defense appropriation would come up.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] in regard to the point of order, if the defense appropriation bill contains legislation to move back the payday, similar to what is contained in this bill, this gentleman, and I believe I would be joined by the gentleman from Minnesota, will again make the same point of order.

□ 1420

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard further on the point of order, as far as I know, there is no similar language in the authorization, but I have an amendment to that bill; if the Rules Committee makes it in order. My amendment would rescind the order of the Secretary of Defense.

Should there be a similar kind of provision in the appropriation bill, I

would join the gentleman from California in this same point of order.

Mr. FRANK. Then, Mr. Chairman, my understanding from the two distinguished budgeteers here is that we would hope to be setting a precedent that would be followed in all the appropriation bills.

Mr. FRENZEL. If it is sauce for the goose, it is sauce for defense, as well.

Mr. FRANK. I wish the gentleman's "sauce" well.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEILENSEN). The point of order is conceded, and the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
HOUSING PROGRAMSANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING  
(INCLUDING RESCISSION AND TRANSFER OF  
FUNDS)

For assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended ("the Act" herein) (42 U.S.C. 1437), not otherwise provided for, \$9,145,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the new budget authority provided herein, \$74,652,000 shall be for the development or acquisition cost of public housing for Indian families, including amounts for housing under the mutual help homeownership opportunity program under section 202 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437bb); \$528,133,500 shall be for the development or acquisition cost of public housing, including major reconstruction of obsolete public housing projects, other than for Indian families; \$2,000,000,000 shall be for modernization of existing public housing projects pursuant to section 14 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437l); \$883,830,000 shall be for assistance under section 8 of the Act for projects developed for the elderly under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q); \$796,258,750 shall be for the section 8 existing housing certificate program (42 U.S.C. 1437f), of which \$47,302,500 shall be for eligible tenants affected by the demolition or disposition of public housing units (including units occupied by Indian families); \$50,000,000 shall be for the section 8 moderate rehabilitation program (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to be used to assist homeless individuals pursuant to section 441 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401); up to \$318,545,152 shall be for section 8 assistance for property disposition; \$1,092,112,375 shall be for use in connection with expiring subsidy contracts; and \$1,208,912,500 shall be available for the housing voucher program under section 8(o) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)): *Provided further*, That of that portion of such budget authority under section 8(o) to be used to achieve a net increase in the number of dwelling units for assisted families, highest priority shall be given to assisting families who as a result of rental rehabilitation actions are involuntarily displaced or who are or would be displaced in consequence of increased rents (wherever the level of such rents exceeds 35 percent of the adjusted income of such families, as defined in regulations promulgated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development): *Provided further*, That up to \$107,617,500 shall be for

loan management under section 8; and, any amounts of budget authority provided herein that are used for loan management activities under section 8(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1437f(b)(1)), and any amounts from the \$1,092,112,375 hereinbefore provided for use in conjunction with expiring subsidy contracts that are used for loan management, shall not be obligated for a contract term that exceeds five years: *Provided further*, That those portions of the fees for the costs incurred in administering incremental units assisted in the certificate and housing voucher programs under sections 8(b) and 8(o), respectively, shall be established or increased in accordance with the authorization for such fees in section 8(q) of the Act: *Provided further*, That of the \$9,145,000,000 provided herein, \$374,062,500 shall be used to assist handicapped families in accordance with section 202(h) (2), (3) and (4) of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q): *Provided further*, That amounts equal to all amounts of budget authority (and contract authority) reserved or obligated for the development or acquisition cost of public housing (including public housing for Indian families), for modernization of existing public housing projects (including such projects for Indian families), and except as hereinafter provided for programs under section 8 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f), which are recaptured during fiscal year 1990, shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That up to 50 percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof up to 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-628, 102 Stat. 3224, 3268) shall not be rescinded, or in the case of cash, shall not be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash shall be used by State housing finance agencies in accordance with such section: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 20 percent limitation under section 5(j)(2) of the Act, any part of the new budget authority for the development or acquisition costs of public housing other than for Indian families may, in the discretion of the Secretary, based on applications submitted by public housing authorities, be used for new construction or major reconstruction of obsolete public housing projects other than for Indian families: *Provided further*, That up to \$14,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading may be transferred and added to sums appropriated for "Salaries and expenses".

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT:

On page 13, line 2, strike out "\$528,133,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$352,133,500".

On page 13, line 5, strike out "\$2,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,002,500,000".

On page 13, line 7, immediately before the semicolon insert the following: ", of which \$2,500,000 shall be for technical assistance and training under section 20 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437r)".

On page 13, line 10, strike out "\$796,258,750" and insert in lieu thereof "\$945,758,750".

On page 14, line 24, insert immediately before the colon the following: "; and

\$15,000,000 shall be used for grants under the Public Housing Drug Elimination Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 11901 et seq.)."

Mr. BARTLETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this is not an earth-shattering amendment in the context of the total \$60 billion HUD and independent agencies appropriation bill. It is an amendment in which a very clear choice is offered to the House floor in terms of how to spend housing dollars. This amendment is not an amendment that cuts.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not reduce total funding out of the HUD appropriation bill. In fact, it leaves the funding exactly the same. It is a very simple and straightforward amendment in which the choice is very clear, and it is not very complicated at all.

The Appropriations Committee was faced with an amount of money totaling \$176 million in which they appropriately concluded that they wished to transfer from moderate rehab a program which was not working very well. That \$176 million had been used for project-based assistance. The committee chose to transfer that to another and more workable housing program. The problem at that point is that the Appropriations Committee chose a wrong program to transfer the money to, wrong from the perspective of the tenants whom they were attempting to assist. The Appropriations Committee transferred the \$176 million to new construction of new units of public housing, a 50-percent increase in public housing new construction over last year and the prior year's appropriations.

The Bartlett amendment would redirect that \$176 million away from the new construction of public housing add-ons and instead add it on to tenant-based certificates, to the drug-free public housing program previously authorized, and to a previously authorized and previously funded resident management corporation.

So the choice is clear. Under the Appropriations Committee version, we would end up with 2,500 additional units of new construction of public housing. In that case the residents or the tenants themselves would have no choices of where they live. The Government would decide where they would live. It would require 3 to 5 years more to get those new units of public housing on line and constructed so people could live in them. And the cost per unit would be \$70,000 per unit in capital costs and an additional

\$44,000 per unit of operating subsidies in 1989 dollars for the life of the units.

The Bartlett amendment, on the other hand, would offer a sharp contrast. The Bartlett amendment would provide assistance to 5,500 families instead of 2,500 as is in the bill, would allow those families to choose themselves where they live and not be required to have the Government tell them where to live, and it would make those certificates and that assistance available immediately so that families would not have to wait 3 to 5 years for assistance. The cost of this would be less than half of what it is in the committee version per unit, that is, \$25,500 per unit.

The Bartlett amendment also provides the funding of an unfunded program of \$15 million in drug-free public housing that was authorized by this Congress in the last session but not funded by the Appropriations Committee. In addition, it would continue to fund at \$2.5 million per year the assistant resident management activities that had been authorized and funded in the last two cycles but which the committee chose not to fund in this particular year.

The housing policy throughout the country, led by the authorizing committee of this Congress and the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development in fact is pushing increasingly toward tenant-based choices, toward allowing tenants to decide for themselves where to live, what landlord to choose, what part of town to live in, and what their housing circumstances would look like. This amendment would continue that set of priorities. Indeed, just simply reading from Public Law 100-242, the last Housing Act of 1987, we in fact authorized at that time only \$337 million for new construction or no more than 5,000 units. In this case the Appropriations Committee has taken it on themselves to reverse that priority and to allocate 7,500 units of new construction.

The choice is very clear as we come to the House floor and vote. If we want to allow low-income families that we choose to assist to make their own choices, then we would vote for the Bartlett amendment and allow those families to decide where to live and under what circumstances. If, on the other hand, we want to continue the housing policies of the past and have the Government make choices for residents themselves, if we want to have the construction of more project-based units and fewer choices for residents at a higher cost, then Members would vote for the committee version of the bill and against the Bartlett amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me first commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BART-

LETT] for offering this very, very good amendment.

I am particularly interested in the part of the amendment that would fund resident management technical assistance and training. Current law provides \$2.5 million in resident management technical assistance and training for fiscal year 1989. This level provides assistance to between 25 and 30 resident management corporations nationwide.

Mr. Chairman, HUD would have 60 resident management corporations coming on line this year. So this money is very much needed in public housing across the country.

Resident management gives residents the control of their own lives. It allows them to unleash their creative energies. By any objective standard, resident managers manage at least as well as the PHA's that precede them, and often they manage their units much more efficiently.

Where we have resident management, Mr. Chairman, we usually have lower crime, higher employment, better physical living conditions, reduced vandalism, and increased rent collections. I have seen the results in Chicago. There is a huge contrast between the LeClaire Courts, which is resident-managed, and, for example, others such as Ida B. Wells, which are PHA-managed.

Here in the Washington, DC, area, in a complex called Kenilworth-Parkside, Kimi Gray has taken the lead in providing resident management to that complex, and according to Coopers and Lybrand rental income in those units is up 117 percent, administrative costs are down 60 percent, maintenance costs are down 20 percent, crime is down 75 percent, AFDC dependency is down 33 percent, teenage pregnancy is down 50 percent, and mean resident income is up \$1,000.

□ 1430

Mr. Chairman, let us make sure that we are efficiently managing the units that are already in use across our country before we go building thousands of new units.

I urge my colleagues to support this small, but very important, change to the VA-HUD appropriations bill, and I urge support for the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], my friend, that, if all this amendment did were to fund the program in which he is interested, I would probably have little problem with this amendment. That is really the tail wagging the dog in terms of the dollars that we are talking about in this amendment, so let me focus on what is by far the large-

est part, and that is the proposal to delete the 2,500 additional units of public housing that we put in this bill.

I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it was not me on the Committee on Appropriations who deviated in the policy of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, but it is the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] that does so because plainly the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs' approach in the legislation over the last few years has been to continue a mixed program, one with heavy emphasis, to be sure, on the tenant-based programs, but one which preserves and has some funding for project-based programs.

Mr. Chairman, we have been faithful to that vision. We provide in this bill 35,000 incremental vouchers, so by far the largest number of incremental units in this bill is coming in the voucher program, and we have been very true, therefore, to the picture of housing that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs has supported and that this Congress has supported in adopting the authorizing legislation of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

However, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs also wanted some project-based housing, and the format that has taken in recent years has been 5,000 units of low-rent public housing and 2,500 units of this section 8 moderate rehab program, and that is how we have funded the family units.

We have also, of course, funded the 202 program for the elderly and the handicapped, and so we maintained that mixed program.

As I explained earlier, we faced a problem this year, and it was one that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs did not anticipate. The problem is one that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs obviously did not anticipate when it last presented us with the authorizing legislation, and that is the disarray into which the section 8 moderate rehab program has fallen.

So, we wanted to keep the bill on an even keel. In fact, last year, as the bill originally came through, we had 2,942 units of that moderate rehab section 8 program. Though we did not have the money to do all of that and to maintain the total of units, 7,942 project-based that we had in last year's bill, so we reduced it somewhat, and we came up with the 7,500-unit proposal for low-rent public housing. Low-rent public housing is the only other project-based program for families that currently exists in the housing legislation as the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs has written it and as this House has passed it, so, if we wanted to maintain the kind of mix we had in the bill last

year, the kind of mix that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs authorized, we had very little choice but to do exactly what the subcommittee and the full committee above the appropriation did.

Now why does the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs want a mix of housing, and why do we on the Committee on Appropriation want a mix of housing? I think the reason is quite simple. Conditions in housing markets are very different in different parts of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the situation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT]. He has got, what, a 15-percent vacancy rate in his housing market? Of course it would be foolish to build public housing units there, and I would not support that, and of course the voucher program works very well in that kind of very loose market where there are lots of vacancies. But this gentleman come from a housing market where there is a 2.4-percent vacancy rate, and roughly half of the people who get vouchers from the housing authority cannot find housing with those vouchers because it is not there even at the rent levels that the voucher program provides.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] wants people to have a choice in housing. Well, I say to my colleagues that there are almost 200,000 families applying for public housing in New York City who cannot be admitted to that housing because very little of it has been built in recent years. Those families want a choice, too, and it is a choice that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] is denying them. I say:

Let's be fair. Let's deal with the problems of his housing market. Let's not create new assisted housing there. Let's use the voucher program there. Let's give his constituents a choice.

However, Mr. President, in my housing market what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] wants to do does not give people a choice. It takes the choice away, and I say, "Let's be fair to the gentleman from Texas, and we have with the 35,000 voucher units."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREEN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, please let us be fair to my constituents, too. Let us be fair to the people in northern New Jersey with the very tight housing market. Let us be fair to the people on Long Island with the tight housing market. Let us be fair to the people in the Boston area with the tight housing market. Let us be fair to many parts of California with tight housing markets. I say to the gentleman from Florida nodding to me that they have a very tight housing market there. Those low-income tenants are entitled to a choice, too.

Mr. colleagues, stick with the committee, and give those folks a choice.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me in the interest of time just agree with the eloquent statement of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN]. Then let me urge everyone to turn down this amendment.

Let me say to the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT], who is a very fine member of the authorizing committee and whose housing judgments I respect greatly, that I think the point he makes in connection with the drug money and the point he makes in connection with tenant management are very well stated. I want to pledge to him that no matter how this works out, if he is not successful, we are going to work diligently in the conference committee to see that we can do something in those two areas which I believe he is correct on.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAXLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] for his kind words about those two areas.

Mr. Chairman, it does occur to me to wonder as to why the drug-free public housing authorized and the authorized and previously funded resident management technical assistance were left out of the appropriations bill. I wonder if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] can enlighten us. My amendment, as the gentleman knows, would reinstate funding for those two programs. They seem to have been defunded.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I must say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] that it was his good effort through this amendment that brought this critical issue to our attention, and for that we are grateful. Another minor problem we had was allocating too little money around here and there, and I think in the course of this dialog he has made an excellent point.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] for his clarification.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment does not prevail.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment would do by striking out the 2,500 units of public housing money, project-based housing, is it would essentially cripple the capacity of housing authorities to deal with a very severe problem of burned-out units. The vast majority of this money for these 2,500 units would go into hous-

ing authority projects where there are burned-out units. If the gentleman would look, and I know how concerned the gentleman is about questions of crime and drug dealing in these units, but, if he looks at the major problem, it is an invitation for drug dealing, for criminal activities in the burned-out units that exist.

Mr. Chairman, it would be my hope that we would continue to maintain the modest effort that this bill provides for that project-based housing. Section 8 vouchers are important. They work very well in tight housing markets, but I think the balance that the committee has struck is the correct balance.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ATKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ATKINS] for yielding because perhaps I can clarify how this amendment would assist in those burned-out units.

Mr. Chairman, last year the State of Massachusetts, for example, received 1,051 new vouchers just out of the voucher program in additional section 8 certificates, but the State of Massachusetts received 162 new units of public housing. I would just comment to the gentleman that it is much more productive, useful, and there is much more freedom of choice to fund new vouchers, and then the State of Massachusetts and other States would be able to use those vouchers, I think, much more productively in a much higher quantity than in new units of housing.

□ 1440

Mr. ATKINS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would simply suggest that those vouchers in Massachusetts did nothing to help with the burnt out units. If you do not deal with a burnt out unit in a public housing project, you have a constant deterioration in the quality of life for the tenants.

There needs to be in this bill some kind of commitment to those 2½ million people in this country who live in public housing projects to begin to eradicate crime, to deal with the problems, many of which are exacerbated by the presence of these burned out units.

The only way you can deal with them, because the modernization funds are not sufficient to totally reconstruct these units, is through the money provided in this section of the bill for these 2,500 units.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Briefly, I do want to follow up on the comment regarding the State of New York which was similar. In fact, last year alone the State of New York received and used 3,775 additional vouchers just from vouchers, but only 400 units of new public housing.

I would further stipulate that the issue here is how to assist families, not how to assist sticks and bricks, whether burned out or not, but how those families can live a decent life.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas quotes those numbers showing that States got more money and more numbers in vouchers than they did in public housing. Of course, the gentleman is correct. That is, because our subcommittee had a mixed program last year, as it has a mixed program this year, and that program heavily emphasized vouchers, as this program heavily emphasizes vouchers. We are talking about 7,500 units of public housing against 35,000 vouchers. Naturally, the States are going to get a lot more vouchers than they are going to get public housing. They are doing it this year. They will do it next year.

Again, I have to say to the gentleman, the units that are given out in New York City, most of them get turned back after the period of the tenants occupying the housing, because they cannot find housing under this section 8 moderate rehab voucher program.

If we are going to give people in New York City choices and give people in other types of markets choices, then we need to continue the mixed program that we have had in the past, that the Banking Committee legislation has and this bill would continue.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the point is that New York City can and does use vouchers in large quantities, but it is not the Government that uses vouchers and it is not the State of New York or the city of New York, it is the people, it is the families themselves who are able to find decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask that the gentleman from California have an additional 3 minutes added to his time.

(At the request of Mr. BARTLETT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DREIER of California was allowed to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent here that we all want to create a wide range of choices. I think that is a goal which every one of us has, and I think that the approach that we have is a little different, obviously.

I would like to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Traxler], and the distinguished ranking member, but I rise as a cosponsor of this amendment with my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT], and I congratulate him for his fine work.

I believe that his approach toward addressing the issue of choice is the appropriate one to take, but I would like specifically to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee for recognizing that a critically important mistake has been made. Virtually every Member here has had a chance to take the well of the House and demagog against the scourge of drugs which has existed and continues to proliferate in public housing projects.

Obviously, a mistake was made in failing to provide that important \$15 million for the public housing drug elimination program.

We know that in the emergency appropriations bill \$8.2 million was provided, but unfortunately none was provided here.

We have a litany of about nine goals which this program is designed to address. We did put it into place through the authorization process.

I hope very much that as this bill moves forward to conference that addressing this important issue of insuring that we work as diligently as possible to get drugs out of public housing is addressed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join in cosponsoring legislation which I have which is designed to speed up the eviction process for these drug kingpins who are in public housing.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that we have increased the operating subsidy account, which is the account from which funds go to public housing agencies for the operation of projects to the tune of over \$151 million, and very plainly a significant portion of that is going to be used to address security and drug problems in the project.

I also think the gentleman ought to be aware that we have language in the bill which would repeal the language that was passed in the supplemental appropriation restricting HUD's right

to give waivers to housing authorities where State due process is in place.

I think we have at least started to address the gentleman's concerns. I know he would like to do more, and so would we, but I think it is fair to point out that we have recognized his concerns and we have tried to address them.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman for that and thank the subcommittee for doing just that, but I hope very much that the chairman will in fact address the issue of the public housing drug elimination program itself and the funding of it. I am a little confused as to exactly where we are going.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, we have committed to the distinguished author of the amendment, the gentleman from Texas, that he raises some very valid issues both in regards to tenant management of the projects and in terms of the drug issue.

I think the gentleman's approach is not unreasonable. We pledge that in the course of this bill winding its way through the tortuous routes to the White House, we will be of every assistance possible on those two issues.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the distinguished gentleman for that assurance.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say that I want to commend the gentleman from California for his interest in this matter. There is no more important issue to this Nation than the serious drug crisis we have.

Mr. DREIER of California. So my point has just been made, Mr. Chairman, that every Member loves to take the microphone and talk against drugs in public housing.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman, understanding the money issue here, is going to join with us in opposing the across-the-board cut in this bill.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to my colleague's Mr. BARTLETT of Texas, amendment which seeks to transfer \$176 million from public housing construction and development to resident management technical assistance, section 8 Housing Rent Subsidy Certificates, and for the Drug Elimination Act.

As many of you are aware, my congressional district in Chicago, IL, is greatly suffering, as are many urban areas, from a public housing crisis. With problems of public housing and homelessness, this is clearly not the time to transfer funds from construction and development.

Over the past 8 years we have seen such a great loss to our Nation's housing programs. Not only have we witnessed a program slash of 70 percent, which reflects a funding cut from \$30 to \$8 billion, we have seen outright abuse within the Reagan administration which has certainly hampered any possibility of improving our housing programs.

I strongly oppose this amendment because my constituents, 70,000 of which reside in public housing, are in need of new public housing construction. Our Nation's housing crisis is a sad reflection of our priorities in this country, and I encourage that my colleagues join in my opposition of this very untimely amendment. Thank you.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bartlett amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is really a most reasonable one. I am speaking now as the ranking minority member of the Housing Subcommittee. I am certainly knowledgeable and informed on the problems of public housing and I have great sympathy and empathy for the problem the committee had in its Hobson's choice here. We have all faced the problem of scarce resources and enormous needs, but we have never adequately funded the public housing units that we presently have.

I have never understood, as I said earlier in this debate, why it makes sense to build more new units when we cannot even adequately maintain those units that we have.

It seems to me that the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] reduces itself to plain arithmetic, and that arithmetic is compelling in terms of pointing us to "the bottom line" of what is at issue here.

Fundamentally, the committee bill gives us new construction and the addition of 2,500 units. That is 2,500 units nationwide, not much at all. These units are very expensive, that conservatively estimated are going to cost in excess of \$70,000 per unit.

The Bartlett amendment simply does this. It transfers most of the increase in new construction to section 8 certificates. For the same amount of money, and this is the arithmetic, for the same amount of money this transfer will allow us to serve more than twice as many low-income households, that is 5,500 certificates versus 2,500 units built some time in the future, which by the way, again does not do one thing to renovate one existing public housing unit.

Let me finish the arithmetic here. We face a growing and serious prob-

lem in some other technical areas, which I will not bore my colleagues about, but take it from me as honest information that we are going to have a horrendous number of units, public units, pulled out of public housing because of the prepayment question.

□ 1450

I do not want to go into the prepayment, but over the next years many are going to be withdrawn from the housing market. The Bartlett amendment makes it clear that the 5,500 certificates could be used to assist any of these tenants who are displaced because of prepayment, and I think that is an important issue that we can face right here, and we will be facing it in greater numbers next year and the year after that.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, it is worth noting that HUD has committed to me firmly that they would use these 5,500 additional certificates as a replacement tool for those prepayments of 221(d)(3)'s and 236's.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Reclaiming my time, for our colleagues, prepayment means the holders of the mortgages and the holders of these units are going to pull out of the program. They are no longer going to be available for certificates, so we are going to have to find alternative means of housing these people, and it is going to be very costly. I think we ought to start right here with the Bartlett amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the concerns of the gentlewoman from New Jersey are very real. I do not think that they are a reason to support the Bartlett amendment, because they are addressed already in the bill. The fact of the matter is that in terms of public housing modernization, the appropriation for the current fiscal year was \$1,647,000,000. It is \$2 billion in the bill we bring to the Members, up over 20 percent. In the case of the expiring housing contracts, we have \$1.1 billion in here.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Reclaiming my time, I want to point out here that it is arithmetic here that we are talking about. We are using numbers in a very funny way.

In the first place, if we put \$9 billion into modernization, we still would not be making much of a dent in the nationwide problem in rehab for public housing.

On the subject of prepayment, I yield to the gentleman who offered the amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, because the committee does take care of expiring contracts, the committee does not attempt to take care of those families who would be moved out of their homes because of a prepayment of a previously insured FHA mortgage. That is what these 5,500 units would do.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. GREEN and by unanimous consent, Mrs. ROUKEMA was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I find it a little odd that the Members of the authorizing committee are asking us to put these units for expiring 221(d)(3)'s and 236's, because they are asking us to make a policy in this bill which many members of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs are not prepared to accept, and that is that people who are living in 236's and 221(d)(3)'s will be taken care of by vouchers. That is not a policy that this Congress has adopted. It is not a policy that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs has brought us and, in fact, as the gentlewoman knows, they brought us a 2-year moratorium on opting out of the program in order to give the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs more time to deal with this problem.

I think if the members of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs do not want the appropriations process to be deciding their policy issues, they should not be deciding that policy issue by this amendment today.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Reclaiming my time, we are not deciding the policy issue how we determine the contractual agreements on prepayment. What we are saying, however, is that an acknowledgment that there are going to be a certain number of increasing number of families that are displaced, and we will give them a priority. That is something that is quite outside the question of the prepayment issue per se.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the point is in housing policy we at the policy level have to start looking at those policies from the perspective of the family themselves to allow that family to make choices. There will be an enormous number of prepaid mortgages that, unless we address it in this appropriations bill, will throw families

out of their units. By passing this amendment, we can assist 5,500 of those individuals to be able to choose decent, safe, and affordable housing of their own. Without the amendment, they are out the window.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that closing comment.

I just wanted to say that that brings us back to the arithmetic of this. The arithmetic is: Do we want to have 2,500 units 3 or 5 years down the line, or do we want to take care of an increasingly difficult problem as it is unfolding before us in the coming year to the effect of taking care of twice as many families?

Again, I would say to the ranking member that I am most appreciative of his Hobson's choice. This is a very difficult dilemma, but I think the gentleman from Texas makes an excellent point by demonstrating that with the same amount of money we can do twice as much in 1 year instead of 5 years down the road.

As the ranking member and as the author of a bill that will be before the Committee on Housing this year, we are going to be looking for new ways of getting at the fundamental problem of multifamily housing and public housing that plagues the gentleman's district and mine where we have very low vacancy rates. So this does not say that we do not need to increase the stock of housing. The question is how do we set our priorities.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. When we get done with it, however, what is being proposed here today is to accept the fact that tenants currently living in subsidized apartments and 221(d)(3)'s and 236's can be thrown out in the street, and then we will try to help them with vouchers, even in markets like the New York City market, where half the people who get vouchers find no place to use them.

I do not think that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs is prepared to offer that to us as policy. I do not think the House is prepared to adopt it, but we surely should not be debating and adopting it on an amendment to an appropriation bill and, therefore, I would urge we defeat this amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, we just have a fundamental difference of the way we view it. The fact is this amendment will allow that individual family to be able to continue to reside in assisted housing, and in this case to

reside in assisted housing of their own choice.

If we adopt the appropriations bill, maybe 5 years from now there may be some Government-operated public housing assistance, and those families, are out on the street.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Reclaiming my time, that will never be equal to the need for the displacement.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT]. This issue really hits home to me. This last week I have had a group of people sitting in my Tucson office because they believe that I am not sufficiently committed to doing something about housing and about homeless people.

I think we have an opportunity today with this amendment to do something for people who need housing today, who cannot wait for tomorrow, who cannot wait for new construction to be added, but who need housing today.

As has been explained in the debate on the floor, this amendment will provide housing for more than twice as many people as we would have with the funds going into new construction. That is pretty simple arithmetic.

Mr. Chairman, more can be done with sec. 8 vouchers than with new construction. We just cannot build as many new units of new housing with construction funds. But we can double the number of families we can get in housing if we adopt this amendment today.

The issue at stake, and I think the more important one, it is freedom. It is choice. It is tenant-based. Instead of the Government telling people where they are going to live and in what kind of lousy public housing project they are going to live in, we can give them a voucher and let them make their own choice of where they want to live. That is the ultimate goal of public housing. That is what this is all about, giving people a choice as to where they want to live.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this body would adopt this amendment and provide more housing for more people and give them the choice of where they want to live.

I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, for offering what I believe is a visionary amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes it very crystal clear that the choice in this amendment is do we as Congress begin to allow tenants of assisted housing to make their own choices on where to live, or do we,

instead, continue to have the Government make those choices for them.

In this case, it is only \$176 million. That means that only 5,500 families can make those choices, but the Committee on Appropriations has found \$176 million of new dollars, of free dollars.

Our choice on this floor is how to spend it. Do we spend it in a way that residents can make their own choices, or do we spend that new money in the old ways of having the Government make the choices for them?

I commend the gentleman for his understanding of that fundamental issue.

□ 1500

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for his comments and certainly concur with the idea that maximum choice is the best approach. As we well know from our experience with public housing projects, we do not have what we would consider to be good housing projects.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, let me say if the gentleman's tenants in his communities would prefer vouchers, they ought to get them. I have to tell him that in my community there are almost 200,000 households who are applying for public housing, and if you gave them a choice between trying to go out in the New York City housing market with vouchers or an apartment in public housing, they will pick that apartment in public housing any day.

I am not trying to deny the gentleman's people their choice, and we have 35,000 units in this bill. Please do not deny my people their choice because we have a different housing market situation from yours. We are entitled to some choice too.

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the BARTLETT amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 152, noes 268, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

#### AYES—152

Archer	Hancock	Ridge
Armey	Hansen	Ritter
Baker	Hastert	Roberts
Ballenger	Hefley	Robinson
Bartlett	Herger	Rohrabacher
Barton	Hiler	Roth
Bateman	Holloway	Roukema
Bennett	Hopkins	Saiki
Bentley	Houghton	Sarpalius
Bereuter	Hubbard	Schaefer
Bilirakis	Huckaby	Schiff
Billey	Hunter	Schulze
Broomfield	Inhofe	Sensenbrenner
Brown (CO)	James	Shaw
Buechner	Johnson (CT)	Shumway
Bunning	Kasich	Shuster
Burton	Kolbe	Skeen
Byron	Kostmayer	Slaughter (VA)
Callahan	Kyl	Smith (MS)
Campbell (CA)	Lagomarsino	Smith (NE)
Chandler	Leach (IA)	Smith (TX)
Coble	Lewis (FL)	Smith (VT)
Coleman (MO)	Lightfoot	Smith, Denny
Combest	Livingston	(OR)
Cox	Lowery (CA)	Smith, Robert
Craig	Lukens, Donald	(NH)
Crane	Machtley	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Madigan	(OR)
DeLay	Marlenee	Solomon
DeWine	Martin (IL)	Spence
Dickinson	McCandless	Stangeland
Dornan (CA)	McCollum	Stearns
Douglas	McCrery	Stenholm
Dreier	McEwen	Stump
Duncan	McMillan (NC)	Sundquist
Edwards (OK)	Meyers	Tauke
Emerson	Michel	Tauzin
Fawell	Miller (OH)	Thomas (CA)
Fields	Moody	Thomas (WY)
Frenzel	Moorhead	Udall
Gallegly	Morrison (WA)	Upton
Gekas	Nielson	Vander Jagt
Gibbons	Oxley	Vucanovich
Gillmor	Packard	Walker
Gingrich	Paxon	Walsh
Goodling	Payne (VA)	Weber
Goss	Penny	Weldon
Gradison	Petri	Whittaker
Grant	Porter	Wylie
Gunderson	Quillen	Young (AK)
Hall (TX)	Ray	Young (FL)
Hammerschmidt	Rhodes	

#### NOES—268

Ackerman	Clinger	Florio
Akaka	Coleman (TX)	Foglietta
Alexander	Conte	Ford (MI)
Anderson	Cooper	Ford (TN)
Andrews	Costello	Frank
Annunzio	Coughlin	Frost
Anthony	Courter	Gallo
Applegate	Coyne	Garcia
Atkins	Crockett	Gaydos
AuCoin	Darden	Gejdenson
Barnard	Davis	Gephardt
Bates	de la Garza	Gilman
Beilenson	DeFazio	Glickman
Berman	Dellums	Gonzalez
Bevill	Derrick	Gordon
Bilbray	Dicks	Grandy
Boehlt	Dingell	Gray
Boggs	Dixon	Green
Bonior	Donnelly	Guarini
Borski	Dorgan (ND)	Hall (OH)
Bosco	Downey	Hamilton
Boucher	Durbin	Harris
Boxer	Dwyer	Hatcher
Brennan	Dymally	Hawkins
Brooks	Dyson	Hayes (IL)
Browder	Early	Hayes (LA)
Brown (CA)	Eckart	Hefner
Bruce	Edwards (CA)	Henry
Bryant	Engel	Hertel
Bustamante	English	Hoagland
Campbell (CO)	Erdreich	Hochbrueckner
Cardin	Espy	Horton
Carper	Evans	Hoyer
Carr	Fazio	Hughes
Chapman	Feighan	Hutto
Clarke	Fish	Jacobs
Clay	Flake	Jenkins
Clement	Filippo	Johnson (SD)

Johnston	Mrazek	Schuette
Jones (GA)	Murphy	Schumer
Jones (NC)	Murtha	Sharp
Jontz	Myers	Shays
Kanjorski	Nagle	Sikorski
Kaptur	Natcher	Siskisky
Kastenmeier	Neal (MA)	Skaggs
Kennedy	Neal (NC)	Skelton
Kennelly	Nelson	Slattery
Kildee	Nowak	Slaughter (NY)
Kleczka	Oakar	Smith (FL)
Kolter	Oberstar	Smith (IA)
LaFalce	Obey	Smith (NJ)
Lancaster	Olin	Snowe
Lantos	Ortiz	Solarz
Laughlin	Owens (NY)	Spratt
Lehman (CA)	Owens (UT)	Staggers
Lehman (FL)	Pallone	Stallings
Leland	Panetta	Stark
Lent	Parker	Stokes
Levin (MI)	Parris	Studds
Levine (CA)	Pashayan	Swift
Lewis (CA)	Patterson	Synar
Lewis (GA)	Pease	Tallion
Lipinski	Pelosi	Tanner
Lloyd	Perkins	Thomas (GA)
Long	Pickett	Torres
Lowey (NY)	Pickle	Torricelli
Manton	Poshard	Towns
Markey	Price	Traficant
Martinez	Pursell	Traxler
Matsui	Rahall	Unsoeld
Mavroules	Rangel	Valentine
Mazzoli	Regula	Vento
McCloskey	Richardson	Visclosky
McCurdy	Rinaldo	Volkmer
McDade	Roe	Walgren
McDermott	Rogers	Watkins
Rose	Rostenkowski	Waxman
McHugh	Rowland (CT)	Weiss
McMillen (MD)	Rowland (GA)	Wheat
McNulty	Roybal	Whitten
Mfume	Russo	Williams
Miller (CA)	Sabo	Wilson
Miller (WA)	Sangmeister	Wise
Mineta	Savage	Wolf
Moakley	Sawyer	Wolpe
Molinari	Saxton	Wyden
Mollohan	Scheuer	Yates
Montgomery	Schneider	Yatron
Morella	Schroeder	
Morrison (CT)		

#### NOT VOTING—11

Aspin	Hyde	Martin (NY)
Collins	Ireland	Payne (NJ)
Conyers	Leath (TX)	Ravenel
Fascell	Luken, Thomas	

□ 1520

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Ireland for, with Mr. Payne of New Jersey against.

Messrs. ENGLISH, FAZIO, and McGRATH changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. HOLLOWAY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 13, line 2, strike out "\$528,133,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$510,633,500".

On page 13, line 5, strike out "\$2,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,002,500,000".

On page 13, line 7, immediately before the semicolon insert the following: ", of which \$2,500,000 shall be for technical assistance

and training under section 20 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437r)".

On page 14, line 24, insert immediately before the colon the following: "; and \$15,000,000 shall be used for grants under the Public Housing Drug Elimination Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 11910 et seq.)."

Mr. BARTLETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I think will be agreed to by the committee as they have previously indicated. This amendment would transfer from the new construction public housing, the sum of \$17,500,000, transfer that into funding the resident management corporation technical assistance, as previously authorized and funded, at the rate of \$2.5 million, and also fund the new program that has been authorized under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the new program providing drug-free public housing.

This would be the first proposal for that program. It is very helpful to get that in the appropriations on this bill. It would fund that program at the authorized rate of \$15 million.

I would express my disappointment that there was opposition to the third part of this amendment, which was to provide additional tenant choice, but that is a debate we will have at a subsequent time on subsequent legislation. However, I do very much appreciate, at least the indications earlier, of the support of these two portions of the amendment. We can get these out of the way and work on the tenant.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, it improves the bill and it does the things that we discussed on the prior amendment. Again, it is acceptable to this side.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], and in yielding, I want to comment that the gentleman from California has shown extraordinary leadership in assuring both the original authorization and now the appropriations of drug-free public housing.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding, and simply would like to express my appreciation again to the chairman of the subcommittee, and I believe to the ranking minority member, who I am sure will be supportive of this amendment. I hope very much that we will now be successful in eliminating the scourge of drugs in public housing.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his amendment. As we indicated, we are happy with this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b)(1) Each contract for loans (other than preliminary loans) or contributions for the development, acquisition, or operation of public housing shall provide that the total development cost of the project on which the computation of any annual contributions under this Act may be based may not exceed the amount determined under paragraph (2) (for the appropriate structure type) unless the Secretary provides otherwise, and in any case may not exceed 110 percent of such amount unless the Secretary for good cause determines otherwise.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall determine the total development cost by multiplying the construction cost guideline for the project (which shall be determined by averaging the current construction costs, as listed by not less than 2 nationally recognized residential construction cost indices, for publicly-bid construction of a good and sound quality) by—

"(A) in the case of elevator-type structures, 1.6; and

"(B) in the case of nonelevator-type structures, 1.75."

#### RENTAL REHABILITATION GRANTS

For the rental rehabilitation grants program, pursuant to section 17(a)(1)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437o), \$130,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992.

#### RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE (RESCISSION)

The limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) is reduced in fiscal year 1990 by not more than \$2,000,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts.

#### HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED FUND

In fiscal year 1990, \$480,106,000 of direct loan obligations may be made under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q), utilizing the resources of the fund authorized by subsection (a)(4) of such section, in accordance with paragraph (C) of such subsection: *Provided*, That such commitments shall be available only to qualified nonprofit sponsors for the purpose of providing 100 per centum loans for the development of housing for the elderly or handicapped, with any cash equity or other financial commitments imposed as a condition of loan approval to be returned to the sponsor if sustaining occupancy is achieved in a reasonable period of time: *Provided further*, That the full amount shall be available for permanent financing (including con-

struction financing) for housing projects for the elderly or handicapped: *Provided further*, That 25 per centum of the direct loan authority provided herein shall be used only for the purpose of providing loans for projects for the handicapped, with the mentally ill homeless handicapped receiving priority: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury in such amounts as are necessary to provide the loans authorized herein: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of the aforesaid fund shall be included in the totals of the Budget of the United States Government: *Provided further*, That of the direct loan authority provided under this heading, an amount necessary to provide for 250 dwelling units shall be used only for the purpose of providing dwelling units for persons who have contracted the disease of acquired immune deficiency syndrome: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 202(a)(3) of the Housing Act of 1959, loans made in fiscal year 1990 shall bear an interest rate which does not exceed 9.25 per centum, including the allowance adequate in the judgment of the Secretary to cover administrative costs and probable losses under the program.

#### CONGREGATE SERVICES

For contracts with and payments to public housing agencies and nonprofit corporations for congregate services programs in accordance with the provisions of the Congregate Housing Services Act of 1978, \$6,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1991.

#### PAYMENTS FOR OPERATION OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

For payments to public housing agencies and Indian housing authorities for operating subsidies for low-income housing projects as authorized by section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g), \$1,769,200,000.

#### HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners—both current and prospective—with respect to property maintenance, financial management, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions and meeting the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership, including provisions for training and for support of voluntary agencies and services as authorized by section 106(a)(1)(iii), section 106(a)(2), and section 106(c) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, \$3,500,000.

#### FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

For assistance to owners of eligible multifamily housing projects insured, or formerly insured, under the National Housing Act, as amended, or which are otherwise eligible for assistance under section 201(c) of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1a), in the program of assistance for troubled multifamily housing projects under the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 1989, and any collections and other amounts in the fund authorized under section 201(j) of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, as amended, during fiscal year 1990, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That assistance to an owner of a multifamily housing project assisted, but not insured,

under the National Housing Act may be made if the project owner and the mortgagee have provided or agreed to provide assistance to the project in a manner as determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

#### EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM

For the emergency shelter grants program, as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, \$125,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### TRANSITIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

For the transitional and supportive housing demonstration program, as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, \$105,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR FACILITIES TO ASSIST THE HOMELESS

For grants for supplemental assistance for facilities to assist the homeless as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, \$11,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON THE HOMELESS

For necessary expenses of the Interagency Council on the Homeless, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title II of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11311-11319), as amended, \$1,200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Council shall carry out its duties in the 10 standard Federal regions under section 203(a)(4) of such Act only through detail, on a non-reimbursable basis, of employees of the departments and agencies represented on the Council pursuant to section 202(a) of such Act.

#### FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION FUND

For payment to cover losses, not otherwise provided for, sustained by the Special Risk Insurance Fund and General Insurance Fund as authorized by the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3(b) and 1735c(f)), \$350,093,000, to remain available until expended.

During fiscal year 1990, within the resources available, gross obligations for direct loans are authorized in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Housing Act, as amended.

During fiscal year 1990, additional commitments to guarantee loans to carry out the purposes of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed a loan principal of \$67,000,000,000.

During fiscal year 1990, gross obligations for direct loans of not to exceed \$88,600,000 are authorized for payments under section 230(a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, from the insurance fund chargeable for benefits on the mortgage covering the property to which the payments made relate, and payments in connection with such obligations are hereby approved.

#### NONPROFIT SPONSOR ASSISTANCE

During fiscal year 1990, within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amounts of direct loans shall not exceed \$1,100,000.

#### GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

##### GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES

During fiscal year 1990, new commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721g), shall not exceed \$75,000,000,000 of loan principal.

#### COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For grants to States and units of general local government and for related expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out a community development grants program as authorized by title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301), \$3,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992, of which \$50,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from amounts deobligated in fiscal year 1990 in the Urban Development Action Grants account: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$75,000,000 shall be available for the discretionary fund established pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301): *Provided further*, That not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated herein (other than a grant using funds set aside in the following proviso) shall be expended for "Planning and Management Development" and "Administration" as defined in regulations promulgated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 shall be made available from the foregoing \$3,000,000,000 to carry out a child care demonstration under section 222 of the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z-6 note): *Provided further*, That after September 30, 1989, no funds provided or heretofore provided in this or any other appropriations Act shall be used to establish or supplement a revolving fund under section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and pursuant to section 202(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987, this action is a necessary (but secondary) result of a significant policy change.

During fiscal year 1990, total commitments to guarantee loans, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5301), shall not exceed \$46,000,000 of contingent liability for loan principal.

#### REHABILITATION LOAN FUND

During fiscal year 1990, collections, unexpended balances of prior appropriations (including any recoveries of prior obligations) and any other amounts in the revolving fund established pursuant to section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452b), after September 30, 1989, are available and may be used for commitments for loans and operating costs and the capitalization of delinquent interest on delinquent or defaulted loans notwithstanding section 312(h) of such Act: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to sell any loan asset that the Secretary holds as evidence of indebtedness under such section 312.

#### URBAN HOMESTEADING

For reimbursement to the Federal Housing Administration Fund or the Rehabilitation Loan Fund for losses incurred under the urban homesteading program (12 U.S.C.

1706e), and for reimbursement to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Agriculture for properties conveyed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Agriculture, respectively, for use in connection with an urban homesteading program approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to section 810 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

##### RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, \$21,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 1991.

#### FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

##### FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, \$12,753,000, to remain available until September 30, 1991: *Provided*, That not less than \$6,000,000 shall be available to carry out activities pursuant to section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987.

#### MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and nonadministrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed \$7,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$697,098,000, of which \$355,846,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 1990, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall maintain an average employment of at least 1,368 for Public and Indian Housing Programs.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$29,112,000, of which \$6,431,000 shall be transferred from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or other requirement, the City of College Park, in the State of Maryland, is authorized to retain any categorical settlement grant funds, urban renewal grant funds, and land disposition proceeds that remain after the financial closeout of the Lakeland Urban Renewal Project (R-44 No. B-79-UR-24-0001), and to use such funds and proceeds in accordance with the requirements of the community development block grant program specified in title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The City of College Park shall retain such funds and proceeds in a lump sum and shall be entitled to retain and use,

in accordance with this paragraph, all past and future earnings from such funds and proceeds, including any interest.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or other requirement, the City of Hartford in the State of Connecticut, is authorized to retain any land disposition proceeds from the financially closed-out Sheldon-Charter Oak, Section A Urban Renewal Project (No. Conn. R-77) not paid to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and to use such proceeds in accordance with the requirements of the community development block grant program specified in title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The City of Hartford shall retain such proceeds in a lump sum and shall be entitled to retain and use, in accordance with this paragraph, all past and future earnings from such proceeds, including any interest.

It is hereby approved in accordance with section 124(c) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-242, 101 Stat. 1815, 1847), that as specified in section 124(a) of such Act, accrued interest is forgiven and interest paid shall be returned to the City of Pittsburgh.

Section 404 in title IV, General Provisions of the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Transfers, Urgent Supplementals, and Correcting Enrollment Errors Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-45) is hereby repealed.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against title II?

Are there amendments to title II?

□ 1530

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment at this point in the bill. I shall not offer the amendment, but I want to describe what my intent is and what I intend to do in a future piece of legislation.

I am talking here about the inspector general at HUD. The IG's office has about \$29 million, with a staff of several hundred people. There are over 400 people down at the IG's office. That is \$29 million and over 400 people.

Those of us who are not on the relevant committee have been reading daily now week after week about the scandals at HUD. We read about fraud and abuse in a variety of programs, especially section 8. Apparently there are five programs now under scrutiny with several others targeted for review. My purpose is not to be partisan. My purpose is to say that when we come to the floor of the House and appropriate money for housing programs to help people in this country who need help and then discover

much later that fraud, waste, and abuse totaling at least, according to some accounts, up to \$2 billion, then it is time for us to ask why and how.

Why is that happening, and how did it happen? How can it be that when we have \$29 million worth of resources in the office of the inspector general to investigate and oversee what is happening and how taxpayer dollars are being spent, we do not have people standing on rooftops sounding the sirens and blowing the whistles to report that this sort of fraud is going on? I want to understand why it happened and how it happened.

My original intent today, Mr. Chairman, was to take \$150,000 from the inspector general and designate it to the GAO, because I would like the GAO to do a complex review of how the inspector general's office has operated and how their budget was spent in the last 8 years. We now estimate that there is over \$2 billion in potential scandal-related losses so far. That is \$2 billion. Let me give some examples so the Members will understand why I question this and why I ask: Where was the inspector general?

With relation to section 8, we are told that the rents on which subsidies were based were improperly inflated, leading to excess payments from HUD that could total \$413 million. Where were audits and investigations and inspections, why did someone not catch that? And if they did catch it and put it in a report someplace, why did they not shout it to someone and make sure that interested parties were informed.

On the question of proper disposition, HUD employs contractors to oversee the sale of homes obtained by the Government when the owners default. HUD and the Justice Department are now investigating the embezzlement of \$20 million or more by a dozen or so settlement agents. How can that happen when we have \$29 million in the IG's office?

A former HUD agent said she kept \$5.5 million from the Government on the sales of foreclosed homes that were owned by HUD, and no one at HUD questioned her about the money for 3 years. She kept \$5.5 million for 3½ years and no one bothered to question her about the money.

Again the question I ask is, if we spend \$29 million to trail these large appropriations that go to HUD, \$29 million for the inspector general to inspect and oversee and investigate, what happened? Where did this money go? Why are these people unable to tell us that this sort of waste, fraud, and abuse has occurred?

What I want to do, Mr. Chairman, is to ask the GAO to do a thorough, comprehensive, broad-based investigation of all these contracts to find out exactly what has happened. I think the taxpayers deserve to know, and I think this Congress must know. How

are we going to prevent this in the future if we do not understand what happened in the past?

So had the rules not prevented it, I would like to have offered this amendment to take \$150,000 from the HUD account and give it to the GAO to find out who got what and why and under what circumstances. That is what I think we owe the taxpayers of this country.

This Government spends a great deal of money. We do it because we believe the purposes are laudable and needs are great. I do not believe that. There are a lot of things I support here on the floor of the House because I think the American people need them, and when we appropriate that money, we expect the money to go not for waste, and abuse; we expect it to go to housing projects and farm programs and help for those in need.

So, Mr. Chairman, I shall not offer the amendment today, but I will, when the legislative appropriations bill comes to the floor of the House, see if we can appropriate sufficient moneys for the GAO to conduct a sufficient investigation and report to Congress what happened at HUD and why and how to prevent it from ever happening again.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of waste, fraud, and abuse should never, ever be tolerated by this Congress, and it will not be tolerated by the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE III

#### INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

#### AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries; \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That where station allowance has been authorized by the Department of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be authorized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Commission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of such allowance: *Provided further*, That when traveling on business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces serving as members or as Secretary of the Commission may be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members of the Commission: *Provided further*, That the Commission shall reimburse other Government agencies, including the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allow-

ances of personnel assigned to it: *Provided further*, That section 509 of the general provisions carried in title V of this Act shall not apply to the funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That not more than \$125,000 of the private contributions to the Korean War Memorial Fund may be used for administrative support of the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board including travel by members of the board authorized by the Commission, travel allowances to conform to those provided by Federal Travel regulations.

#### CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18, and not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$35,500,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$325,000 of these funds shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits for the Commissioners of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

#### COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the Court of Veterans Appeals as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 4051-4091, \$3,000,000.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$12,569,000, to remain available until expended.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition or purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; lease purchase, under a lease purchase contract hereby authorized to be entered into by the Environmental Protection Agency, which lease purchase contract shall have a term not to exceed twenty years and shall provide that title to the property shall vest in the United States at or before the expiration of the lease term, for the Motor Vehicles Emissions Laboratory; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project; and not to exceed \$7,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$874,583,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be expended for purposes of Resource Conservation and Recovery Panels established under section 2003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6913).

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978,

as amended, and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, \$31,734,000, of which \$10,317,000 shall be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund trust fund.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For research and development activities, \$241,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1991: *Provided*, That not more than \$11,600,000 of these funds shall be available for procurement of laboratory equipment: *Provided further*, That up to \$5,000,000 of the funds provided by this paragraph may be transferred to and merged with sums appropriated for "Salaries and expenses".

#### ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For abatement, control, and compliance activities, \$785,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1991: *Provided*, That up to \$10,000,000 of the funds provided by this paragraph may be transferred to and merged with sums appropriated for "Salaries and expenses": *Provided further*, That up to \$2,000,000 shall be available for grants and cooperative agreements to develop and implement asbestos training and accreditation programs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration pursuant to section 118(h)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be expended for purposes of Resource Conservation and Recovery Panels established under section 2003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6913), or for support to State, regional, local and interstate agencies in accordance with subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, other than section 4008(a)(2) or 4009 (42 U.S.C. 6948, 6949).

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment for facilities of, or use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111 (c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), \$1,425,000,000, to be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund, plus sums recovered on behalf of the Hazardous Substance Superfund in excess of \$82,000,000 during fiscal year 1990, with all of such funds to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA, as amended: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 111(m) of CERCLA, as amended, or any other provision of law, not to exceed \$46,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to carry out activities described in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of CERCLA and section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the Agency for Toxic Sub-

stances and Disease Registry to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA, as amended, during fiscal year 1990: *Provided further*, That no more than \$220,000,000 of these funds shall be available for administrative expenses.

#### LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, \$76,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than \$6,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

#### CONSTRUCTION GRANTS (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For necessary expenses to carry out the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Water Quality Act of 1987, \$2,024,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$989,000,000 shall be for title II (other than sections 201(m)(1-3), 201(n)(2), 206, 208, and 209) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; \$989,000,000 shall be for title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; and \$46,000,000 shall be for title V of the Water Quality Act of 1987, consisting of \$7,000,000 for section 510, \$20,000,000 for section 513, and \$19,000,000 for section 515: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, (1) of the funds appropriated for title VI, the Administrator shall reserve 2 percent of the amount authorized under section 607 for allotment to each State, or \$200,000, whichever is greater, for grants to implement nonpoint source programs under section 319; and (2) the reserves under sections 205(j)(1), 205(j)(5), and 604(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act may be, at the discretion of a State, 2 percent of the amount authorized under sections 207 and 607; the funds reserved under section 205(j)(1) and 604(b) in excess of 1 percent of allotted amounts are not subject to the requirements of section 205(j)(3); and the amount used under section 603(d)(7) may be based on the amount authorized under section 607: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in previous fiscal years under this heading to carry out the purposes of section 206(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, \$47,700,000 are rescinded: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding sections 602(b)(6) or 201(g)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, amounts awarded in a capitalization grant to an agency of any State, including funds transferred pursuant to section 205(m), shall be available for providing assistance in that State for the construction of publicly owned treatment works as defined in section 212 of that Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, from sums appropriated under this paragraph and allotted to the State of Texas under section 205 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, the State of Texas is authorized to set aside, at the discretion of the Governor, up to \$15,000,000 for the establishment of a special revolving fund for the sole purpose of making loans to residents of colonias in the counties of Cameron, Hidalgo, Zapata, Starr, Webb, Maverick, Val Verde, Terrell, Brewster, Presidio, Hudspeth, and El Paso. Repayment amounts

may remain in the special revolving fund for future loans to colonia residents, and funds set aside but not used for loans, including repayment amounts, may be transferred by the State to its general title VI revolving fund. Loans from the special revolving fund shall be made for the purposes of connecting residences to sewer collection systems and making any necessary plumbing improvements to enable such residences to meet existing county or city code requirements. The Texas Water Development Board is authorized to use funds from this set-aside for the administrative expenses of the special revolving fund: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, from sums appropriated under this paragraph and allotted to the State of South Carolina under section 205, the Administrator shall award a grant under title II for \$6,800,000 for construction of a connector sewer line, consisting of a main trunk line and four pump stations, for the Town of Honea Path, South Carolina to the wastewater treatment facility in the Town of Ware Shoals, South Carolina.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, after September 30, 1990, amounts deposited in the Licensing and Other Services Fund from fees and charges assessed and collected by the Administrator for services and activities carried out pursuant to the statutes administered by the Environmental Protection Agency shall thereafter be available to carry out the Agency's activities in the programs for which the fees or charges are made.

In order to promote the development of innovative technology for the study, mitigation and management of hazardous and toxic substances, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may lease a portion of the Environmental Technology and Engineering Center located in Edison, New Jersey to the New Jersey Institute of Technology, under such terms and conditions which he determines to be in the public interest, for a term not to exceed ten years. Such lease may be with or without consideration and any compensation received may be used by the Agency to defray costs of providing the space and supporting services.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality, in carrying out their functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-224), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, including not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$861,000.

#### NATIONAL SPACE COUNCIL

For necessary expenses of the National Space Council, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; \$1,200,000: *Provided*, That the National Space Council shall reimburse other agencies for not less than one-half of the personnel compensation costs of individuals detailed to it.

#### OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and

Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed \$1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$2,027,000: *Provided*, That the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall reimburse other agencies for not less than one-half of the personnel compensation costs of individuals detailed to it.

#### FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY DISASTER RELIEF

For necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire and purchase of motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343); uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency preparedness; transportation in connection with the continuity of Government program to the same extent and in the same manner as permitted the Secretary of a Military Department under 10 U.S.C. 2632; and not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; \$141,329,000.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$2,439,000.

#### EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as amended (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), section 103 of the National Security Act (50 U.S.C. 404), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, \$271,160,000.

#### NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

##### (TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Of the funds available from the National Flood Insurance Fund for activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, \$10,734,000 shall, upon enactment of this Act, be transferred to the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for administrative costs of the insurance and flood plain management programs and \$40,303,000 shall, upon enactment of this Act, be transferred to the "Emergency management planning and assistance" appropriation for flood plain management activities. In fiscal year 1990, no funds in excess of (1) \$32,000,000 for operating expenses, (2) \$165,000,000 for agents' commissions and taxes, and (3) \$3,500,000 for interest on Treasury borrow-

ings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations.

#### EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

There is hereby appropriated \$134,000,000 to the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out an emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of Public Law 100-77, as amended: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed three and one-half per centum of the total appropriation.

#### GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

##### CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Information Center, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,360,000, to be deposited into the Consumer Information Center Fund: *Provided*, That the appropriations, revenues and collections deposited into the fund shall be available for necessary expenses of Consumer Information Center activities in the aggregate amount of \$5,200,000. Administrative expenses of the Consumer Information Center in fiscal year 1990 shall not exceed \$2,092,000. Appropriations, revenues and collections accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1990 in excess of \$5,200,000 shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

##### OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Consumer Affairs, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,888,000.

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

##### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation and modification of real and personal property; purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than administrative aircraft, necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; \$5,203,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 1991: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$384,000,000 is for space transportation capability development only, which amount shall not become available for obligation until April 15, 1990, and pursuant to section 202(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987, this action is a necessary (but secondary) result of a significant policy change: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading for space station development, not more than \$484,500,000 shall be available for supporting development, operations/utilization capability, and management and integration.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROE

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROE: On page 43, line after the ":", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading \$98,000,000 shall be made available for the National Aerospace Plane."

□ 1540

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that was agreed to in our earlier colloquy with the distinguished chairman and ranking member on our national aerospace plane.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey is correct, and we are delighted to accept his amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, this is the subject we discussed at length in debate on the rule, and of course we are happy to accept it.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that it is a pleasure to do business with the distinguished chairman of the authorizing committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I extend my good will and graciousness to both the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for their kindness in including my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SPACE FLIGHT, CONTROL AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for; in support of space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including operations, production, services, minor construction, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and modification of real and personal property; tracking and data relay satellite services as authorized by law; purchase, hire, maintenance and operation of other than administrative aircraft; \$4,709,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 1991: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$1,400,000,000 is for space transportation system only, which amount shall not become available for obligation until April 15, 1990, and pursuant to section 202(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987, this action is a necessary (but secondary) result of a significant policy change: *Provided further*, That \$50,000,000 of the funds appropriated in section 101(g) of Public Law 99-591 for orbiter production shall be available until September 30, 1991, for all expenses of this account.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For construction, repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and for facility planning and design not otherwise provided, for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, \$384,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated under this heading by this appropriations Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations therefor, the amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended, except that this provision shall not apply to the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization for repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and facility planning and design: *Provided further*, That no amount appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be used for the lease or construction of a new contractor-funded facility for exclusive use in support of a contract or contracts with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under which the Administration would be required to substantially amortize through payment or reimbursement such contractor investment, unless an appropriations Act specifies the lease or contract pursuant to which such facilities are to be constructed or leased or such facility is otherwise identified in such Act: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may authorize such facility lease or construction, if he determines, in consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next appropriations Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities: *Provided further*, That up to \$35,000,000 of the funds provided by this paragraph may be transferred to and merged with sums appropriated for "Space flight, control and data communications" and/or "Research and program management": *Provided further*, That with funds appropriated under the Research and Development account to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this Act, and subsequent appropriations Acts, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may enter into a contract with the California Institute of Technology to amortize the Observational Instruments Laboratory over a ten-year period for a total cost of not to exceed \$14,000,000; plus applicable financing costs equal to the ten-year Treasury Bond Rate plus 2 1/4 percent, under the authority granted under Public Law 98-45. The building shall be built at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory with title to be vested initially in the California Institute of Technology, and to revert to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration upon completion of payments.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROE

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROE: On page 46, line 9, strike the colon and all that follows through line 22, and replace it with a period.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the amendments that we discussed

earlier in the bill and had a colloquy on with our distinguished chairman and ranking member which in effect would strike a section of the bill relating to the Observational Instruments Laboratory.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in accord with our agreement, and we are very pleased to accept it on this side.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] has adequately stated the amendment, and we are happy to agree on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of research in Government laboratories, management of programs and other activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); awards; lease, hire, purchase of one aircraft for replacement only (for which partial payment may be made by exchange of at least one existing administrative aircraft and such other existing aircraft as may be considered appropriate); maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft; purchase (not to exceed thirty-three for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and maintenance and repair of real and personal property, and not in excess of \$100,000 per project for construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, repairs, and rehabilitation and modification of facilities; \$1,957,200,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under this appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$35,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for scientific consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$8,795,000.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

##### MINORITY PARTICIPATION IN THE SPACE STATION

(a) FEDERAL FUNDING.—The NASA Administrator shall, to the fullest extent possible, ensure that at least 10 percent of Federal funding for the development, construction, and operation of the space station be made available to business concerns or other organizations owned or controlled by socially

and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a)(5) and (6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(5) and (6))), including Historically Black Colleges and Universities and minority educational institutions (as defined by the Secretary of Education pursuant to the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.)).

(b) OTHER PARTICIPATION.—The NASA Administrator shall, to the fullest extent possible, ensure significant participation, in addition to that described in subsection (a), in the development, construction, and operation of the space station by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a)(5) and (6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(5) and (6))) and economically disadvantaged women).

#### POLAR PLATFORM

Of the funds made available in this Act for space station development, not more than \$10,700,000 shall be reduced from the \$107,000,000 requested for work performed on or under the work package numbered 3 prime contract (polar platform).

#### NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

##### CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

During fiscal year 1990, gross obligations of the Central Liquidity Facility for the principal amount of new direct loans to member credit unions as authorized by the National Credit Union Central Liquidity Facility Act (12 U.S.C. 1795) shall not exceed \$600,000,000: *Provided*, That administrative expenses of the Central Liquidity Facility in fiscal year 1990 shall not exceed \$864,000.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

##### PAYMENT TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

For payment to the National Institute of Building Sciences, \$500,000.

#### NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

##### RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880-1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; \$1,715,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1991: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this Act, or from funds appropriated previously to the Foundation, not more than \$97,000,000 shall be available for program development and management in fiscal year 1990: *Provided further*, That contracts may be entered into under the program development and management limitation in fiscal year 1990 for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year: *Provided further*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be made available for a new academic research facili-

ties program: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the amount appropriated is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROE

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROE: On page 50, beginning on line 18, strike the words, "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be made available for a new academic research facilities program:".

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, this is the third amendment which was agreed to earlier in the colloquy by our distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], and it has to do with striking some restrictive language.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is part of our understanding, and it is acceptable.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the research and operational support for the United States Antarctic Program pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875); maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research and operations support; maintenance and operation of research ships and charter or lease of ships for research and operations support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; \$74,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That receipts for support services and materials provided for non-Federal activities may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no funds in this account shall be used for the purchase of aircraft other than ones transferred from other Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That no funds in this or any other Act shall be used to acquire or lease a research vessel with ice-breaking capability built by a shipyard located in a foreign country if such a vessel of United States origin can be obtained at a cost no more than 50 per centum above that of the least expensive technically acceptable foreign vessel bid: *Provided further*, That, in

determining the cost of such a vessel, such cost be increased by the amount of any subsidies or financing provided by a foreign government (or instrumentality thereof) to such vessel's construction: *Provided further*, That if the vessel contracted for pursuant to the foregoing is not available for the 1989-1990 austral summer Antarctic season, a vessel of any origin may be leased for a period of not to exceed 120 days for that season and each season thereafter until delivery of the new vessel: *Provided further*, That the preceding three provisos shall not apply to appropriated funds used for the lease of the vessel POLAR DUKE, nor for procurements covered by the GATT Agreement on Government Procurement.

#### AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. COUGHLIN

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments and I ask unanimous consent they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. COUGHLIN: On Page 51, line 17, strike "or lease".

On page 51, line 18, place a "." after "capability" and strike the balance of that line through "construction" on page 52, line 1.

On page 52, line 1 and 2, strike "if the vessel contracted for pursuant to the foregoing is not available for" and add in its place "during".

On page 52, line 5, place a "." after "thereafter" and strike the balance of that line through "vessel:" on line 6.

On page 52, line 6, strike "three" and add in its place "two".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment would do would be to put on hold temporarily the acquisition of an icebreaking scientific vessel by the National Science Foundation. This year's budget request included provisions for two different icebreakers. There was a budget request for a \$244 million new start for the Coast Guard to construct an icebreaker which would have scientific capabilities for the National Science Foundation. At the same time the National Science Foundation is planning to construct a scientific vessel which would have icebreaking capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, we have in the transportation Appropriations Subcommittee proposed eliminating the funding for the new start by the Coast Guard. This would see to put the Coast Guard and the National Science Foundation on an equal basis and put both the icebreakers on hold to see if the two can resolve the differences and come up

with a common icebreaker. I believe it may have the approval of the chairman and the ranking member, but the amendment is really that simple in its purpose.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAXLER. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Louisiana.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that the National Science Foundation needs this research ship, icebreaker, because, of course, it would be designed to support year-round, large-scale, multidisciplinary research in higher latitudes, and this research is really central to the understanding of many of the scientific endeavors in which this body and the other body are engaged. It fits in, of course, with the global warming experiments that are being conducted and many other critical environmental and resource related issues.

Mr. Chairman, the NSF ship would not be a competitor with the U.S. Coast Guard icebreaker. They are totally different ships, and they have totally different missions. We have to have this ship that can have the capability of a scientific laboratory that can conduct these multidisciplinary research programs, and the Coast Guard very badly needs an icebreaker with the ice-breaking capabilities that this ship would be able to have.

Mr. Chairman, we have only two icebreakers in the Coast Guard now. They are 20 years old, and they are constantly being laid up for repairs, so this is not an either/or situation that we need either an icebreaker by the Coast Guard or an icebreaker, fully equipped research laboratory to do the multidisciplinary research of the National Science Foundation. It is critical to our country that we be able to have both of these ships.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we will not accept the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. Boggs] in the presentation that she has made.

Mr. Chairman, this is an icebreaker which is very important to the science missions of NSF. As most of my colleagues have noted, much of the research run at the South Pole is run by the NSF, and we are in fact engaged in major scientific experiments there.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is vital that this particular program goes forward. We are attempting within the language that has been developed for the icebreaker and for the

RFP that has gone out to try to assure that it is something that expands American technology, and it certainly would be something which would enhance the work of NSF.

□ 1550

So I would hope that we would keep this particular vehicle on track and assure that NSF does have this capability in the future.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, it is not the intention of this Member to eliminate the icebreaking program and the scientific program of the National Science Foundation.

Heretofore the National Science Foundation research has been done aboard a Coast Guard icebreaker in the Antarctic, as the gentleman knows. What I am trying to do is see if we cannot get the National Science Foundation and the Coast Guard together, save some money, and produce only one icebreaking vehicle with the ice-breaking capability. I am not trying to interfere with the Coast Guard.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman, but the effect of his amendment at this particular time, and I understand where the gentleman is trying to go, he is trying to work out something later on down the pike, but the effect of his amendment right now does appear to be a detriment to where the National Science Foundation has been heading, and that is our concern. That is within our jurisdiction and we are concerned about the effect of this particular amendment.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I just would point out that, of course, nothing will happen with this until the bill is signed by the President, which is down the line a considerable way.

I would hope that we might put this amendment in at this time and then try to resolve the issue before it goes to the President. No contract will be let until the bill is signed anyway.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I would join the gentleman and hope that something can be worked out here. I am not certain that approving the amendment at this time is the route to that particular kind of settlement, but I would certainly join the gentleman in hoping that we can work something out.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I sympathize highly, and though I am opposed to the amendment I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] that he has raised a very important point and we have recognized this. It is an important one, because as the gentleman pointed out in his work on transportation and we have in ours, that the relationship between the Coast Guard and NSF where icebreaking is concerned is a coordinated program, and I think the gentleman is heading in that direction.

That is being considered by OMB, and according to language we have placed in our Antarctic program legislation 2 years ago, and they are supposed to report back to us from OMB very soon.

I think the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is right, however, because we are out now for the bid and this would destruct that whole program maybe for 6 or 8 months or even a year.

So I would hope from my point of view as chairman of the committee that we will follow specifically on the gentleman's area of concern to see that this matter is resolved, but I think we would be making a grave error if we were to stop the program now and wait another 2 or 3 months. It is a complex bid. There is a lot to it.

I would assure the gentleman if he would withdraw his amendment that we will work with him to get this thing resolved.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Louisiana.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

When we are talking about cost-benefit ratios, we should also consider operating costs. It has been estimated that the National Science Foundation icebreaker has an annual operating cost of about \$14 million, whereas the Coast Guard would have an operating cost of about \$50 million.

I think they have different missions. They need different kinds of construction, and therefore different kinds of operating costs.

I do feel very strongly that in the Antarctic all U.S. citizens and all of us in this body can be very proud of the work that the National Science Foundation conducts there and the fact that it is the lead agency among the various agencies that operate in Antarctica, and that should make us very comfortable with the fact that they need an icebreaker and should have one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COUGHLIN was allowed to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I simply would point out that the language I have continues to permit the National Science Foundation to lease icebreaking ships and scientific ships which they are doing, and have the capability of doing presently. It would not interfere with that program.

I just would point out again, of course, this bill will not be effective until it is signed by the President in any case, so that the provisions presently in the bill permitting the contract to be let, would not delay in any way the letting of the contract, because the contract cannot be let until this bill is signed by the President.

Mr. WALKER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I think our concern, however, as I understand it, the RFP is now out on the street, and that while the contract may not be able to be let until the money is available, we do think that a decision to withhold the authorization out of the bill at this time might interfere with the ability to responsibly run the RFP Program at the present time. That is our concern.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I think we did a similar thing last year when we put the "Buy America" provision in it. If you recall, we had the provision in the bill, and then did a similar thing.

Mr. WALKER. I am not certain that the RFP Program was on the streets at that point as we now have the situation.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I think the RFP was on the streets at that time.

Mr. WALKER. Well, the gentleman is more of an expert in the field than I am, but I think that is largely the concern of the effect the gentleman's amendment might have at this point.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

There is one point that we have to make here. In the continuity of this program, as I am just looking at some of the background details at the moment, the contract is to begin on November 1, 1990, so if we do not move that program now and work the thing out, we are going to be losing out on the overall program.

I would hope that the gentleman would either withdraw his amendment, or I would urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

The amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SCIENCE EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science and engineering education programs and activities pursuant to the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$210,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1991: *Provided*, That to the extent that the amount of this appropriation is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

#### NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

##### PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101-8107), \$21,260,000.

#### SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 4101-4118) for civilian employees; and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$26,313,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States: *Provided further*, That no later than January 1, 1990, the Selective Service System shall revise the basis for the classification of a person as a conscientious objector under 32 CFR 1636 to conform to the standards established by *Clay v. United States*, 403 U.S. 698 (1971).

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order against the language beginning on line 22 of page 53 and continuing through line 2 on page 54.

The point of order is that language constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, and violates clause 2, rule XXI, of the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEILENSEN). The point of order has been conceded, and the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE IV CORPORATIONS

Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 1990 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

#### FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD AND FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Until such time as the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation are abolished pursuant to the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989, such Board and Corporation shall take such action as may be necessary to minimize losses at insured institutions (as defined in section 401(a) of the National Housing Act).

#### TITLE V GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 501. Where appropriations in titles I, II, and III of this Act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System; to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to travel performed in connection with major disasters or emergencies declared or determined by the President under the provisions of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974; to site-related travel performed in connection with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; to site-related travel under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended; or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules: *Provided further*, That if appropriations in titles I, II, and III exceed the amounts set forth in budget estimates initially submitted for such appropriations, the expenditures for travel may correspondingly exceed the amounts therefor set forth in the estimates in the same proportion.

SEC. 502. Appropriations and funds available for the administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Selective Service System shall be available in the current fiscal year for

purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 503. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831).

SEC. 504. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 505. No funds appropriated by this Act may be expended—

(1) pursuant to a certification of an officer or employee of the United States unless—

(A) such certification is accompanied by, or is part of, a voucher or abstract which describes the payee or payees and the items or services for which such expenditure is being made, or

(B) the expenditure of funds pursuant to such certification, and without such a voucher or abstract, is specifically authorized by law; and

(2) unless such expenditure is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office or is specifically exempt by law from such audit.

SEC. 506. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be expended for the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency between his domicile and his place of employment, with the exception of any officer or employee authorized such transportation under title 31, United States Code, section 1344.

SEC. 507. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for payment, through grants or contracts, to recipients that do not share in the cost of conducting research resulting from proposals not specifically solicited by the Government: *Provided*, That the extent of cost sharing by the recipient shall reflect the mutuality of interest of the grantee or contractor and the Government in the research.

SEC. 508. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used, directly or through grants, to pay or to provide reimbursement for payment of the salary of a consultant (whether retained by the Federal Government or a grantee) at more than the daily equivalent of the maximum rate paid for GS-18, unless specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 509. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act for personnel compensation and benefits shall be available for other object classifications set forth in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations.

SEC. 510. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Nothing herein affects the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission pursuant to section 7 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2056 et seq.).

SEC. 511. Except as otherwise provided under existing law or under an existing Executive order issued pursuant to an existing law, the obligation or expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for contracts for any consulting service shall be limited to contracts which are (1) a matter of public record and available for public inspection, and (2) thereafter included in a publicly available list of all contracts entered into within twenty-four months prior to the date on which the list is made available to the public and of all contracts on which performance has not been completed by such date. The list required by the preceding sentence shall be updated quarterly and shall include a narrative description of the work to be performed under each such contract.

SEC. 512. Except as otherwise provided by law, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be obligated or expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) for a contract for services unless such executive agency (1) has awarded and entered into such contract in full compliance with such Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder, and (2) requires any report prepared pursuant to such contract, including plans, evaluations, studies, analyses and manuals, and any report prepared by the agency which is substantially derived from or substantially includes any report prepared pursuant to such contract, to contain information concerning (A) the contract pursuant to which the report was prepared, and (B) the contractor who prepared the report pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 513. Except as otherwise provided in section 406, none of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency.

SEC. 514. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in 15 U.S.C. 2001 with an EPA estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon.

SEC. 515. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1990 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through line 18 on page 60 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against that portion of the bill?

Are there any amendments?

□ 1600

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

SEC. 516. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended for personnel compensation and benefits payments for any individual serving as a deputy assistant secretary, deputy assistant administrator, deputy assistant director, or deputy general counsel

who is appointed: (1) under schedule C as defined under 5 CFR 6.2; (2) as a noncareer, limited term, or limited emergency appointee as defined under 5 U.S.C. 3132; or (3) without regard to civil service rules or regulations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COUGHLIN

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUGHLIN: On page 60, strike line 19 through line 2 on page 61, and insert the following:

SEC. 516. None of the funds provided in Titles I or III of this Act shall be obligated or expended for personnel compensation and benefits payments for any individual serving as a deputy assistant secretary, deputy assistant administrator, deputy assistant director, or deputy general counsel who is appointed: (1) under schedule C as defined under 5 CFR 6.2; (2) as a noncareer, limited term, or limited emergency appointee as defined under 5 U.S.C. 3132; or (3) without regard to civil service rules or regulations. After January 1, 1990, and for the duration of fiscal year 1990, within the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the number of noncareer, limited term, or limited emergency appointees to the Senior Executive Service shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total number of Senior Executive Service positions in such department, unless the Office of Personnel Management certifies in a Report to the Congress that a determination was made to grant a waiver to such limitation in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3134. The Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget, shall undertake an expedited review of Senior Executive Service positions in the Department of Housing and Urban Development and report its findings, recommendations, and justification for any waiver determination to the Congress by October 1, 1989.

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I believe has been agreed to by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee and has been worked out with the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The amendment is acceptable on the side.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, and we are happy to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: In title V on page 61, after line 2, insert the following new section:

Sec. 517. None of the funds appropriated under title II of this Act under the heading entitled Community Planning and Development, Community Development Grants, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States may be obligated or expended to any municipality where it is made known to the appropriate official in the department, agency or instrumentality concerned that three or more employees, acting on orders of superiors of such municipality, have been convicted hereafter of the use of unnecessary force against nonviolent civil rights demonstrators.

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have worked this out with the chairman, and I think he is prepared to accept this amendment. I just want to make the point that the intent behind this amendment is to try to assure that the communities across the Nation are not using violent means against nonviolent demonstrators. I will put in some legislative history.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, it is an excellent amendment, and I join with the gentleman. I accept the amendment on this side.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to ask for a vote on the amendment.

I must say that I do not personally approve of it. I think we are setting a dangerous precedent in saying that if a municipality's police force acts improperly that the city can lose its community development funds, all of its community development block grant funds, and the amendment has had to be drafted in a way to meet the Parliamentarian's requirements and withstand a point of order. It makes it almost impossible to know how to do it.

We are asked, for example, that the appropriate official at HUD, if it is made known to the appropriate official

in the Department, that certain things have occurred, that then the funds must be withheld. I do not know if someone comes up to the Secretary of HUD as he is entering the HUD Building and says, "Psst, buddy, three police officers in Altoona have been convicted under the circumstances of the Walker amendment," at that point the Secretary must withhold funds from Altoona, and I think it is a dangerous amendment, a dangerous precedent.

Mr. Chairman, no, I am not going to win the vote, so I am not going to ask for a vote.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1990".

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GEPHARDT, having assumed the chair, Mr. BEILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2916) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUD SHOULD CLEAN UP ITS ACT

(Mr. GLICKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was not on the floor when the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] came to the floor to ask about a possible change in the amount of money appropriated for the Inspector General to deal with the issue of fraud in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. At that time the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] was trying to express his view that Congress take specific action to deal with the issue of fraud as it affects housing units all over this country, as has been indicated in hearings chaired by our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] did not offer the amendment because he indicated that perhaps the more appropriate place would be to come back to this floor in September and get an appropriation for the General Accounting Office to do an investigation of HUD's inspector general's agency as well as the Secretary's office to see what can be done to stop this abuse that is occurring around the United States, taking advantage of taxpayers' funds.

My question to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] is twofold. No. 1, would he support an increase in funds to allow the General Accounting Office to do an investigation of HUD's Inspector General Office as well as the Secretary's office to see if they are properly monitoring this scandal and, in addition, what needs to be done to augment the investigative powers of this Government to actually ensure that the scandal be fully investigated and the ripoffs stopped?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, let me say that a small study probably would not require any additional funds. The GAO money is in the legislative bill. If it were a large study, probably some kinds of funds would need to be added there or some language in the legislative bill to that end.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Would the gentleman support a GAO study of the Inspector General's Office at HUD?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. I think that the gentleman's request is not unreasonable.

Mr. GLICKMAN. In addition, would the gentleman support an increase in funding, let us say, of the Inspector General's Office itself if it were proven to have acted properly but it

needed additional resources to investigate the fraud that has occurred all around this country of ours which has hurt people who need so desperately the housing units that are offered by HUD?

Mr. TRAXLER. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his colloquy. It is an atrocity what has happened around this country with respect to HUD. It is our job in Congress to make sure that HUD cleans up its act.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2939 FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1990**

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 207 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 207**

*Resolved*, That any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2939) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI and clause 7 of rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During the consideration of the bill, all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived except against the following provisions: the sixth proviso under the paragraph entitled "Economic Support Assistance"; the second proviso under the paragraph entitled "Multilateral Assistance Initiative for the Philippines"; that portion of the sentence beginning with "unless that" through the period at the end of the paragraph entitled "International Military Education and Training"; that portion of the sentence beginning with "and (3)" through the period at the end of the paragraph entitled "El Salvador—Investigation of Murders"; sections 527, 548, 563, (a)(3), (4), (5), (7), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f), 579, 581, and 583. In any case where this resolution waives points of order against only a portion of a paragraph, a point of order against any other provision in such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. It shall be in order to consider the amendment by, and if offered by, Representative Obey of Wisconsin, or his designee, said amendment shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto, shall

not be subject to amendment, and all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XVI and clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived.

□ 1610

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 207 is a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2939, the foreign operations, export financing, and related appropriations bill for fiscal year 1990. The bill will be open to germane amendments under the 5-minute rule.

In order to accommodate the fullest possible discussion of the numerous foreign policy issues raised by this legislation, the rule provides 2 hours of general debate. The time is to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

To facilitate the timely consideration of this appropriations measure, the rule further waives all points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI and clause 7 of rule XXI.

The rule also waives clause 2 and clause 6 of rule XXI against the bill, except for specific provisions listed in the rule. Where the rule waives points of order against only a portion of a paragraph, a point of order may be made against only the portion of the paragraph not protected, rather than against the entire paragraph. With respect to the lack of authorization for certain appropriations in the bill, it should be noted that section 552 of the bill prohibits the expenditures of any funds appropriated in this bill until the enactment of the necessary authorizing legislation.

The rule makes in order an amendment offered by Representative OBEY of Wisconsin, or his designee, regarding the reopening of West Bank schools by the Israeli Government. The amendment is debatable for 1 hour, equally divided by the proponent and a Member opposed to it. Points of order are waived against the amendment for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI and clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule provides for this amendment in order to implement a floor agreement reached on June 29, 1989.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides over \$14 billion in appropriations for a number of foreign aid programs. The overall funding level is below the administration request and is consistent

with the budget resolution for fiscal 1990.

As the chairman of the International Task Force of the Select Committee on Hunger, I wish to congratulate and thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for the effort he had made to support funding for child survival and international health. The committee has earmarked at least \$245 million from development assistance for child survival activities and international health, plus at least 20 percent of the assistance included in the fund for sub-Saharan Africa for improving health conditions, with special emphasis on meeting the health needs of mothers and children. This 10-percent requirement would add another \$51.5 million for these purposes.

I also wish to commend the committee for the earmark of not less than \$42 million for international AIDS prevention and control, the earmark of \$8 million for the vitamin A deficiency program, and the allocation of at least \$5 million to help eliminate river blindness. The committee further deserves commendation for the funding of \$40 million for the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the \$65.4 million for UNICEF, the \$75 million for microenterprise programs, the \$995 million for the World Bank's International Development Association, and the funding commitment and report language relating to women in development. Pursuant to the House-passed authorization bill, the committee has adjusted a transferral of \$920 million from the Economic Support Fund account to development assistance.

There are many other excellent provisions in this bill that time precludes me from citing. Nevertheless, those of my colleagues who are concerned about addressing basic human needs in the developing world will find much to support in this bill. I would encourage them to carefully review the good job that the committee had done in allocating the limited funding at its disposal.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan rule designed to facilitate House consideration of important foreign aid-related issues. I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has done an able job of explaining the provisions that are contained in this somewhat complicated rule. During my remarks, I would like to shed what light I can on two aspects of this rule so that Members will have a more complete understanding of how this rule was arrived at.

First, I would like to comment on the issue of waivers. This bill contains a boat load of legislative language. That's the bad news. The good news is

that most of these legislative provisions are technical in nature. In fact, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, its chairman, Mr. OBEY, and its ranking Republican, Mr. EDWARDS have done an admirable job in keeping foreign policy micromanagement to a minimum in this bill. The whole subcommittee is to be commended.

Nevertheless, there is extensive legislative language in the bill, most of which is protected under the rule by waivers of those standing rules of the House that prohibit legislative language and reappropriations in general appropriations bills. The issuance of such waivers in a rule is always troubling to me, and it certainly is true in this case.

It seems to me that there are two major reasons why this bill contains so much legislative language.

One reason has to do with the procedural management in the full House. It's just a fact of life that the congressional budget process has come to consume an ever increasing amount of our time. And the authorizing committees have been the big losers in this whole process.

The other reason has to do with the other body. The handicaps of the budget process notwithstanding, the House always manages to pass a foreign aid authorization bill. You can't have a more dynamic or effective committee chairman than DANTE FASCELL. But Mr. FASCELL can't run the Senate. And the fact of the matter is that the Senate has managed to pass only one foreign aid authorization bill in the last 7 years.

So foreign aid has, almost invariably, ended up in the appropriations process. Hence, the appropriations bills on foreign aid end up getting loaded with legislative provisions which really should more properly come from the authorizing committee.

The second comment I would like to make concerning this proposed rule has to do with the amendment to be offered by Mr. OBEY or his designee.

It is my understanding that a compromise has been reached on this amendment. At the appropriate time, Mr. OBEY will yield the floor to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. NIELSON], who will then offer the amendment. Mr. NIELSON had planned to offer this amendment several weeks ago when the foreign aid authorization bill was being debated. But he graciously agreed to withhold his amendment at that time when the managers of that bill promised him the opportunity to offer it on this bill.

Again, I have to say that it troubles me to have this kind of an amendment in an appropriations bill. However, a pledge had been made to Mr. NIELSON, and I believe a compromise has been reached by all interested members concerning the precise wording of Mr. NIELSON's amendment.

And so I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, by noting that this foreign operations bill is one of the better ones we've seen in a long time. Those members who are well disposed toward our foreign aid program will find much to support. The administration has signed off on it, although the specific provisions on El Salvador and the Philippines will probably need some further work—and, indeed, those two areas will be subject to amendment under this rule.

□ 1620

Mr. Speaker, I would again commend not only the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] and the Committee on Rules for the rule, but also the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and the ranking member of the subcommittee for delivering this kind of bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. NIELSON] who has an amendment on the bill.

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Committee on Rules for its very fair treatment of me in this particular regard and also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and other Members involved, to say that I appreciate the rule.

I think the rule completes the pledge that was made to me. I did withhold the amendment having to do with opening the schools on the West Bank from the authorization bill 2 weeks ago in order to avoid a possible conflict and consternation about the July 5 meeting of the Likud Party.

I appreciate this opportunity. Since that time some positive steps have been taken. The resolution we have drafted now is apparently acceptable to all parties and we are now going to offer that amendment during the amendment process tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the consideration of the entire Committee on Rules and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we did have other speakers, but I do not see them on the floor, and at this time, if the gentleman from Ohio has no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appear to have it.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 417, nays 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—417

Ackerman	DeFazio	Hayes (LA)
Akaka	DeLay	Hefley
Alexander	Dellums	Hefner
Anderson	Derrick	Henry
Andrews	DeWine	Herger
Annunzio	Dickinson	Hertel
Anthony	Dicks	Hiler
Applegate	Dingell	Hoagland
Archer	Donnelly	Hochbrueckner
Armey	Dorgan (ND)	Holloway
Aspin	Dornan (CA)	Hopkins
Atkins	Douglas	Horton
AuCoin	Downey	Houghton
Baker	Dreier	Hoyer
Ballenger	Duncan	Hubbard
Barnard	Durbin	Huckaby
Bartlett	Dwyer	Hughes
Barton	Dymally	Hunter
Bateman	Dyson	Hutto
Bates	Early	Inhofe
Bellenson	Eckart	Ireland
Bennett	Edwards (CA)	Jacobs
Bentley	Edwards (OK)	James
Bereuter	Emerson	Jenkins
Berman	Engel	Johnson (CT)
Bevill	English	Johnson (SD)
Billbray	Erdreich	Johnston
Bliley	Espy	Jones (GA)
Boehlert	Evans	Jones (NC)
Boggs	Fascell	Jontz
Bonior	Fawell	Kanjorski
Borski	Fazio	Kaptur
Bosco	Feighan	Kasich
Boucher	Felds	Kastenmeier
Boxer	Fish	Kennedy
Brennan	Flake	Kennelly
Brooks	Flippo	Kildee
Broomfield	Florio	Kleczka
Browder	Foglietta	Kolbe
Brown (CA)	Ford (MI)	Kolter
Brown (CO)	Ford (TN)	Kostmayer
Bruce	Frank	Kyl
Bryant	Frenzel	LaFalce
Buechner	Frost	Lagomarsino
Bunning	Gallo	Lancaster
Burton	Garcia	Lantos
Bustamante	Gaydos	Laughlin
Byron	Gejdenson	Leach (IA)
Callahan	Gekas	Lehman (CA)
Campbell (CA)	Gephardt	Lehman (FL)
Campbell (CO)	Gibbons	Leland
Cardin	Gillmor	Lent
Carper	Gilman	Levin (MI)
Carr	Gingrich	Levine (CA)
Chandler	Glickman	Lewis (CA)
Chapman	Gonzalez	Lewis (FL)
Clarke	Goodling	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Gordon	Lightfoot
Clement	Goss	Lipinski
Clinger	Gradison	Livingston
Coble	Grandy	Lloyd
Coleman (MO)	Grant	Long
Coleman (TX)	Gray	Lowery (CA)
Combest	Green	Lowe (NY)
Conte	Guarini	Lukens, Donald
Cooper	Gunderson	Machtley
Costello	Hall (OH)	Madigan
Coughlin	Hall (TX)	Manton
Courter	Hamilton	Markey
Cox	Hammerschmidt	Marlenee
Coyne	Hancock	Martin (IL)
Craig	Hansen	Martin (NY)
Crockett	Harris	Martinez
Dannemeyer	Hastert	Matsui
Darden	Hatcher	Mazzoli
Davis	Hawkins	McCandless
de la Garza	Hayes (IL)	McCloskey

McCollum	Poshard	Smith, Robert
McCrery	Price	(OR)
McCurdy	Pursell	Snowe
McDade	Quillen	Solarz
McDermott	Rahall	Solomon
McEwen	Rangel	Spence
McGrath	Ray	Spratt
McHugh	Regula	Staggers
McMillan (NC)	Rhodes	Stallings
McMillen (MD)	Richardson	Stangeland
McNulty	Ridge	Stark
Meyers	Rinaldo	Stearns
Mfume	Ritter	Stenholm
Michel	Roberts	Stokes
Miller (CA)	Robinson	Studds
Miller (OH)	Roe	Stump
Miller (WA)	Rogers	Sundquist
Mineta	Rohrabacher	Swift
Moakley	Rose	Synar
Mollinari	Rostenkowski	Tallon
Mollohan	Roth	Tanner
Montgomery	Roukema	Tauke
Moody	Rowland (CT)	Tauzin
Moorhead	Rowland (GA)	Thomas (CA)
Morella	Roybal	Thomas (GA)
Morrison (CT)	Russo	Thomas (WY)
Morrison (WA)	Sabo	Torres
Mrazek	Saiki	Torricelli
Murphy	Sangmeister	Towns
Murtha	Sarpalius	Trafigant
Myers	Savage	Traxler
Nagle	Sawyer	Udall
Natcher	Saxton	Unsoeld
Neal (MA)	Scheuer	Upton
Neal (NC)	Schiff	Valentine
Nelson	Schneider	Vander Jagt
Nielson	Schroeder	Vento
Nowak	Schuette	Visclosky
Oakar	Schulze	Volkmer
Oberstar	Sensenbrenner	Vucanovich
Obey	Sharp	Walgren
Olin	Shaw	Walker
Ortiz	Shays	Walsh
Owens (NY)	Shumway	Watkins
Owens (UT)	Shuster	Waxman
Oxley	Sikorski	Weber
Packard	Siskis	Weiss
Pallone	Skaggs	Weldon
Panetta	Skeen	Wheat
Parker	Skelton	Whittaker
Parris	Slattery	Whitten
Pashayan	Slaughter (NY)	Williams
Patterson	Slaughter (VA)	Wilson
Paxon	Smith (FL)	Wise
Payne (VA)	Smith (IA)	Wolf
Pease	Smith (MS)	Wolpe
Pelosi	Smith (NE)	Wyden
Penny	Smith (NJ)	Wyllie
Perkins	Smith (TX)	Yates
Petri	Smith (VT)	Yatron
Pickett	Smith, Denny	Young (AK)
Pickle	(OR)	Young (FL)
Porter	Smith, Robert	
	(NH)	

## NAYS—1

Crane

## NOT VOTING—13

Billakis	Hyde	Ravenel
Collins	Leath (TX)	Schaefer
Conyers	Lukens, Thomas	Schumer
Dixon	Mavroules	
Gallegly	Payne (NJ)	

## □ 1647

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# AUTHORIZING ADDITION OF NAMES OF MEMBERS TO LIST OF COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2273.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be authorized to sign and submit requests to add the names of Members to the list of cosponsors on H.R. 2273.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT). Is there objection of the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

## FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1990

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 207 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2939.

## □ 1649

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2939) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes, with Mr. ECKART in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under this rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from California [Mr. Lewis] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

## □ 1650

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated to the Committee on Appropriations yesterday, this is, tongue in cheek, the most popular of the 13 appropriation bills which we bring to the floor each year. Everyone always hungers for an opportunity to vote for foreign aid. I wish, frankly, that we had a greater understanding of the role of foreign assistance. I have always been baffled by people who are willing to spend billions of dollars to provide guns to solve a problem internationally which might have been avoided had we expanded a much smaller amount to provide an opportunity for economic stability and political stability which very often prevents military problems.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I would like to thank many staff people who helped put together this bill including Terry Peel, Bill Schuerch, Mark Murray, Bob Lester, Laurie Mayez, Georgia SanBernelli and a number of others. I would certainly also like to express my thanks to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr.

FASCELL] of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for their most understanding work with us so that we might complement each other's work in bringing this bill to the House.

Very simply this bill is about \$14.3 billion. It is \$316 million below the administration's official request, but the administration, after it submitted its official request, in effect added \$400 million to the request for the Export-Import Bank, which means that we are actually \$716 million below the administration's real request for this bill for the coming fiscal year.

Title I through III, which are the non-export-related items of the bill, are \$836 million below the administrations' request. We are right on the button in terms of our 302 allocation under the Budget Act.

As I said in the Committee on Appropriations, there are a number of anomalies in this bill because the outlay authority, which we were given by the budget summit, does not correspond to the budget authority number which we were given in the budget summit, and, as a consequence, we have had to make some decisions which in my view are irrational in terms of where we put dollars.

So, because we have the formalistic approach of Gramm-Rudman, we are required in my judgment to put dollars in some instances in places where they do less good than they would do if we were not wearing our green eye shades, and if we were thinking more about policy consequences and getting the biggest bang for the buck for the taxpayers' money. I regret that, but under the processes forced on us by the Gramm-Rudman procedure I can do nothing about it.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is a bipartisan bill. It is supported by the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle, and it is supported by the administration. The administration does reserve the right in conference to offer or to try to seek changes to amend the judgments that we have reached in the committee bill, but for purposes of House passage the administration is for the bill as we bring it to the Members.

Mr. Chairman, economic support funds, military assistance funds, and development funds are all, give or take, 1 percent roughly, the same amount as were provided last year. We have provided \$184 million less for the international financial institutions than the administration requested. For the Export-Import Bank the administration asked for \$110 million originally. They amended that request to \$500 million. This bill provides \$615 million for the Export-Import Bank. That is the portion of this bill which attempts to stimulate American exports. It, along with the trade and development program, represents the

two major efforts in this bill to make us competitive on world markets, and I think those sections of this bill are worthy of my colleagues' support.

In the Middle East we have fully funded, the administration's request, and in addition we have provided 7.5 million earmarked for Lebanon. We have provided \$28 million for Poland and Hungary, much of which is in response to the President's new announcement during his visit to Eastern Europe. We have funded refugees at 40 million above the administration request. We have funded many other programs, including Peace Corps, anti-terrorism, narcotics, and the like at the requested level.

For the Philippines the administration has requested a new item which would ask us in effect to provide \$200 million above and beyond our original aid program for that country. We have in this bill provided \$160 million rather than that \$200 million. I personally think that is too much, but we compromised in an effort to reach some accommodation with the administration. I should point out that that will come on top of the economic supported assistance and military and development assistance under which the Philippines could receive as much as \$634 million. I do not think that money can be spent effectively. I think it is a mistake to provide that much, but in the process of compromise with the administration we have, for this year at least, given them partial benefit of the doubt, but have refused to fully fund their request.

Mr. Chairman, we have provided no money whatsoever for the hard loan window at the World Bank. Those who know me know that I fully recognize the value to U.S. interests of our contributions to that Bank, but the fact is that while Secretary Brady and Secretary Mulford have tried very hard to get American money center commercial banks to recognize their obligation to help deal with the problem of Third World debt by accurately recognizing the deflated value of their debt holdings in the Third World, the fact is the Secretary has met with very little success in dealing with American money center banks. Until he does, and until we have a comprehensive approach to deal with the situation in many other countries besides Mexico, for instance, I did not feel that we could in good conscience put any money in that window because we have the great likelihood that that money will go to the Third World and simply be reflowed into the pockets of American money center banks. I do not think the American taxpayer ought to have to pick up that tab.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask for the support of my colleagues on this bill. I appreciate the cooperative approach that Mr. EDWARDS and all members of the subcommittee have taken. I want

to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. NIELSON] for his persistence and his cooperation in working out a compromise approach to the West Bank schools issue.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have the podium at this moment because my ranking member has to be at an urgent meeting for a short time. Taking advantage of this opportunity, let me express the deepest respect and admiration for the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and my ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], for the diligent work that they have been about successfully regarding this measure.

Foreign assistance is the toughest legislative work in the House. Appropriate moneys in a tough budget year when everybody is looking for dollars for some special project at home or has some very special bias regarding responsibilities overseas, the work of this subcommittee becomes most difficult.

I must say in my experience on the subcommittee there is no question that we have progressively made significantly important movement in recognizing that foreign assistance matters do not involve partisan politics, and indeed partisanship should depart when we leave our shoreline.

In a shrinking world America has very, very significant responsibilities in the developing world insofar as the future of democracy is concerned.

The work of this subcommittee, which includes foreign assistance and foreign military sales, is the kind of legislative activity that our constituents would love most to beat us over the head about. It is controversial when you suggest to spend taxpayer dollars in any way overseas, but I believe there is a fantastic misconception as to just how much money we spend for this assistance.

This bill involves something less than \$15 billion. That is a small piece of our annual budget which is over \$1 trillion. Foreign assistance is just over 1 percent of our total expenditures—a very small fraction of our national budget when you are talking about America's responsibility to lead in the world. Of that 1 percent much of these funds never leave our shores and are spent on American goods; support U.S. jobs.

There is not any question in my mind that the bipartisan approach that has been developed in our subcommittee is helping the House to be more effective in assisting the admin-

istration to carry out that important responsibility of leadership.

Within this package I wanted to mention a few things that are of particular importance to me to southern California. First and foremost, much of the work that takes place in Latin America, our portion of the world, is handled through multilateral programs. The significant work of the World Bank, the significant work of the Inter-American Development Bank, impacts developing countries, especially the poorest of the poor, those countries that need help in meeting the challenge to expand democracy, move forward through these programs.

I must say that in the 8 years I have been on the committee, there has been progressive attention paid to the reality that we must attempt as we deliver funds to those developing countries and ensure that those funds will help move those countries in the direction of exercising economic policies that make sense. Progress in that connection has made a real difference in country after country.

In this bill, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] indicated that the World Bank, the IBRD, had been zeroed out. Now, frankly, before we get through the entire process, go to conference with the other body, it is my sincere hope that we will fund this program. But the point that the subcommittee is making with this item and the point that my chairman especially wants to make is that these high debt in developing countries is a very significant, problem and the solution is almost out of hand.

Much of the difficulty related to that debt involves American banks and the poor judgment used regarding these loans. The banks have a responsibility to help us solve those problems.

The message is, friends, we are not going to send more money through that multilateral just to bail out American banks or others who have a private interest in that regard. It is very important that we all recognize that the public and the private sector is in the soup on this one and we had better come together and find some real world solution.

Within the World Bank there is an organization known as IDA, the International Development Association, which gives soft loans to developing countries. They are loans that largely operate on a 35-year loan basis at zero interest with a significant grace period. They have in the past been used very extensively to help countries like India, and others among the poorest of the poor.

From time to time some of us have suggested that those loans could be used in a better fashion to ensure sup-

port for economic policies that lead to growth.

We have indeed made some progress down that channel.

One element of our bill dealing with IDA involves a program for lending to China. We, in the last several years, have been very encouraged by the potential for progress in China. Of late however, we have had reason to rethink on assistance there.

The zero interest loans through IDA have been suspended for China, and within our bill we were successful in including language that calls upon the administration to report to the Congress in very direct terms regarding changes of policy or attitudes which might promote individual freedoms and human rights.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill in terms of the responsibility of Congress in providing leadership for freedom in the world.

I must say that the progress that we have made, in this committee and in the House, is a most positive indication that we will find the Congress operating in a fashion that indeed does endorse the fact that foreign affairs has nothing to do with partisan politics, and in turn, foreign affairs is going to be a reflection of American policy abroad that our friends and allies can count upon.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I want to commend the gentleman for his statement. There is no question about it, foreign aid is a very tough issue, no question about that at all.

The question that should be asked, though, is whether the expenditure that we are contemplating is good for the United States?

Having said that, though, it is good for the United States to have stable democracies around the world that can protect themselves and advance economically.

I think this is a good bill. It is not perfect. People on both sides of the issue can find things to complain about, not enough money for this project, too much for that one; but it does, like the authorization bill, I think, represent a good bipartisan effort with Republicans and Democrats in the Congress coming together and working with the administration. When we do that, it is absolutely amazing to me to see what the result is worldwide. When we all agree, we usually succeed.

So Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman and also the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee for working very

hard and coming up with a bill that is worthy of the support of all of us.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of my colleagues.

I would say as I close my time that I appreciate the work of my colleague on the Authorization Committee of the Foreign Affairs Committee in connection with the fundamental policy that is involved here.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH].

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield briefly, I would simply like to express my thanks to him for helping work out a number of very crucial items on this bill. As usual, the gentleman's help has been invaluable.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and thank the chairman of our subcommittee more particularly for his exceptional leadership on this bill.

As the gentleman stated earlier, this bill enjoys bipartisan support.

□ 1710

It is the product of close cooperation between the Republicans and Democrats on our subcommittee, as well as between our subcommittee and the administration. It is a reflection of the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], and other members of our subcommittee who have worked hard to put together this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Chairman, bipartisanship always involves compromise, and this bill is a series of compromises. For that reason, there are provisions in the bill which Members will like and dislike. It is not a perfect bill by anyone's measure, but I think on balance it is a constructive and balanced bill, a responsible bill in light of our budget constraints and in light of our responsibilities abroad.

I therefore want to begin by urging my colleagues to support the bill on final passage. I think the chairman and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] have laid out many of the details in the bill, and, thus, I would like to spend most of my time focusing on one or two items which are of major interest and concern to me.

The first is the Middle East. I think most Members realize that a significant share of the assistance in this bill goes to the Middle East and, specifically, to two countries, Israel and Egypt. The total amount of assistance in this bill is a little more than \$14 billion. About \$5 billion of that total is allocated to those two countries. This is a reflection of the fact that the United States continues to have vital interests

in the Middle East, and a fundamental goal of U.S. policy is stability in that region.

I strongly believe that the funds in this bill, while significant, are very important in promoting stability and America's interest in that region. However, it is also important as we approve these appropriations to be clear about what stability means in the Middle East in the context of American interests. Stability certainly means the avoidance of war, and the military assistance that we provide to both Israel and Egypt helps to deter war. There are nations such as Syria and Libya, that might be tempted to initiate war with Israel or Egypt if they were not strong and secure. Our aid helps them to maintain their security and their strength, and in the process serves our interests as well as theirs.

Stability also means that friendly governments must respond to the legitimate economic needs of their own people, and the substantial economic assistance we provide helps Israel and Egypt respond to those needs, preserving not only their economic security but political stability as well.

What is perhaps most important to our goal of promoting stability is something beyond our military or economic assistance. It is coming to grips with the underlying issues that create political instability in the first place. For example, real stability will require Arab acceptance of Israel within secure borders. At the same time, Israel must respond in a meaningful way to the aspirations of the Palestinian people. Unless these issues are resolved, there will not be any real stability in the Middle East.

These difficult issues cannot be resolved militarily. They cannot be resolved by the United States, by the United Nations, or by some other outside agency imposing a political settlement. These issues can be resolved only if the parties in the region themselves sit down and negotiate directly to resolve these underlying problems.

For that reason, it has always been a key element of American policy to try to find a mechanism by which the parties in the Middle East, the Arabs and Palestinians on the one hand and the Israelis on the other, can meet and negotiate directly.

I raise the Middle East as an issue this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, because it seems to me that we are at a critical juncture in our search for peace and stability in the Middle East.

Earlier this year, Yasser Arafat, the chairman of the PLO, stated publicly for the first time that he accepted the existence of Israel, that he accepted the key U.N. resolutions, 242 and 338, and that he renounced terrorism as a means of achieving his political ends. Given the history of the PLO, there is ample reason for skepticism, but these

statements did represent a departure from the past and Mr. Arafat took some risk politically and perhaps even personally in making those statements.

In response, the United States for the first time opened up a political dialogue with the PLO, albeit at a low level. Some have criticized this action by our Government, but I think it was a sensible response; it not only was a positive response to Arafat's new position, but a way by which we could encourage the PLO to act more constructively and peaceably in dealing with the State of Israel.

Finally, the Prime Minister of Israel took what I think is a very important step. Prime Minister Shamir proposed an election on the West Bank and Gaza by which Palestinians could elect their own representatives, after which there would be direct negotiations between those representatives and Israel. This is a constructive proposal, and I applaud our administration for encouraging and supporting it. However, if this proposal is to work, if it is to lead to direct negotiations which are so important to stability in the region, it must have the full support of all the parties in the region, not simply our support.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the circumstances surrounding Mr. Shamir's proposal at this time. I am concerned because the Palestinian community is holding back, refusing to support the proposal or participate in the elections. I am concerned because there are some elements in Israel that are attempting to impose preconditions on the elections and on negotiations.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is time for those of us who truly care about our vital interests in the Middle East, for those of us who believe that promoting stability there serves our vital interests, for those of us who believe that stability is dependent upon direct negotiations leading to an ultimate political settlement to speak out clearly in support of Mr. Shamir's proposal for elections and negotiations, to speak out clearly against those who advocate violence, and beyond that, to speak out clearly against those who would try to scuttle elections and negotiations by imposing the kind of preconditions that could discourage the other side from participating in elections and negotiations.

Mr. Chairman, I think this bill is important not only as a vehicle for providing the essential military and economic aid to our friends in the Middle East that is essential to their interests and ours, but it is a vehicle for stating clearly that we support elections and direct negotiations between the Israelis and Palestinians, and that we oppose those in the region, Arab or Israeli, who would try to scuttle the peace process.

Finally, in my judgment the administration has been acting responsibly to foster and encourage the peace process, and thus we should support that effort and resist the temptation to place obstacles in the administration's way.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention one other item in this bill that I have some concern about; it relates to the restructuring of how we provide development assistance abroad. In the authorization bill that was recently before the House, there was a restructuring of the way in which development assistance is provided. I think the general goal was to give the administration more flexibility in how we deliver development assistance, and a reasonable agreement can be made for that general approval.

Our appropriation bill necessarily tends to follow the work of the authorization committee in this respect. However, I have to note that while we have created in both the authorization appropriation bills a large, rather undefined development assistance account which, in theory, gives the administration considerable leeway, we have at the same time imposed a series of earmarkings which do not seem to have much coherence. They tend to reflect particular and sometimes very narrow interests that various Members may have.

□ 1720

As a result, we have certain earmarkings for particular countries, earmarkings for one or another region, and earmarkings for certain agencies. I think this diminishes the initial thrust of the reform, and we have something of a hodge-podge in terms of the administration of development assistance. We cannot solve that problem now, but I think it is important for those of us who serve on both the authorizing and the appropriating committees to look very carefully at how development assistance is really going to be administered and then determine whether this new approach really works. If it turns out that there is confusion and a lack of coherence in the new approach, I hope we will go back and correct the problem.

One again, I thank the chairman for yielding and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished and able gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO].

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and want to congratulate Chairman OBEY and ranking member MICKEY EDWARDS for achieving this compromise bill that is supported by both sides of the aisle and by the administration.

It is not a perfect compromise, but it is the best we could achieve under tight budget constraints.

As a new member of the Appropriations Committee and of this subcommittee, I now have a greater appreciation of the difficulty in moving a foreign aid bill through Congress.

In this bill, we balance funding among security and humanitarian assistance, economic and development assistance, and on top of all this, the need to provide export financing assistance to level the playing field in the international market. We must address our long-term security interests as well as continuing this Nation's policy of the good neighbor and the helping hand to people in desperate need.

While our foreign aid programs only account for approximately 1 percent of U.S. expenditures, it serves the direct interest of the United States in many important ways.

It enhances our national security. Without U.S. support, I believe a number of democratic regimes in strategic areas throughout the world would have been overthrown by radical insurgencies.

Our foreign aid budget also allows the United States to join with other countries in responding to needs of developing countries throughout the world and to respond to world catastrophes, such as the earthquake in Armenia and the famine in Ethiopia.

The bill provides important funding for Israel and Egypt, other allies and base rights countries. And, in many other strategically important areas of the world, we maintain our presence through economic, military and development assistance. We have expressed our support for the new multilateral initiative to strengthen democracy in the Philippines and we have maintained the 7- to 10-ratio for aid to Greece and Turkey.

We also provide development assistance for needy Third World countries. Through the Agency for International Development, these countries will receive assistance in areas such as agriculture, child survival, education, environment and technology, and private sector initiatives.

These same efforts are bolstered by our contributions to such agencies as the United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF], the United Nations Development Program [UNDP], United Nations Environment Program [UNEP], the International Fund for Agriculture Development [IFAD], and the U.N. Voluntary Fund for Women [UNIFEM].

Further, this bill provides funding to address two critical areas that affect all our lives—the international spread of the AIDS virus and the continued cultivation of illegal drugs.

One area that also requires our immediate attention is the shortfall in funding for migration and refugee assistance. Over the years, I have worked with the administration and other Members of Congress to gain the release of Soviet, Ukrainian, and Armenian refuseniks.

As a result of this persistent pressure by the United States, the Soviet Government is now allowing a large number of citizens to emigrate. We must follow through on our commitment to these individuals by providing the necessary funds to help them settle in new areas.

Finally, we have provided \$595 million for the Export-Import Bank's Direct Loan Program. In addition, we have provided \$20 million for a new I-Match Program that will need to be authorized by Congress. In total, this is an \$80 million reduction from last year's level for Exim but it is a \$115 million increase over the administration's request.

In a world of aggressive international financing by our foreign competitors, the Exim is the only game in town for American business.

Just last week, I read in the New York Times that Japan is funding its Export-Import Bank at a level of \$13.5 billion.

So even at level funding, our Export-Import Bank barely scratches the surface of the need for financing to compete in world markets.

With our trade deficit widening and our budget getting leaner, it will be even harder to meet the growing need for Exim direct loans.

I appreciate our chairman's commitment to do as much as we can given these limited resources and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to address this issue.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], chairman of the subcommittee, for another excellent job this year in his leadership on this bill. This is an important issue, and it is an issue which, yes, some people in this country find rather distasteful. They do not like foreign aid, but I think those people, frankly, do not really understand what role foreign aid plays in trying to bring about peace around the world, and even more in trying to educate and provide an increased standard of living to those in very seriously poor and disadvantaged conditions.

The bill is a good balance of and mixture of economic support funds, economic development funds, AID

money, and some security assistance. There are a number of countries which, unfortunately, still to this day, especially on the African Continent, we have yet to find enough money to really be able to go beyond the point that we have been for the last few years. Once again, the appropriations bill, this bill is within the constraints of the budget and the agreement and, therefore, most all of the appropriations in this bill to individual countries are basically the same as they were 2 years ago when we last passed a Foreign Operations Appropriation bill.

The foreign aid bill which passed this House by an almost 3-to-1 margin was the basis on which the Appropriations Committee did their deliberations, and I think they have done an excellent job of staying within the parameters of where the authorizing committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs on which I sit, has in fact set their priorities. I can assure my colleagues that as the chairman of the International Narcotics Task Force on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the money that we have put into the authorizing bill and the language which we have consistently striven to have become law, to help countries around the world on narcotics so that we ourselves get some help, is in the appropriations bill. And there is strong language relating to moneys to be spent for narcotics-related educational money, and money diverted to stamping out certain of the narcotics problems in various countries as well so that all agencies of Government hopefully will, like in the State Department, be brought into the process.

The bill, as the speaker who preceded me in the well indicated, is also a testimony to the balance that we have attempted to strike on issues like peace in the Middle East. Yes, a significant share of this particular bill goes to the Middle East, and that is frankly because it is such an area of grave concern to us, and we have tried for so many years to do what we consider to be the right thing.

We have a strong, consistent ally in Israel. We have other countries in the region who receive significant foreign aid from us, like Jordan, Egypt, Oman, and others. We have tried to strike a significant balance between the competing interests of Israel and the Arab world, and we have tried by policy in the last few months, and the United States has been a leader in this, to bring all of the necessary parties to the bargaining table, trying to bring those competing interests, those historically diverse and adverse interests from one country to the other in that region, to bring them together, to bring some of the parties who are not within government, parties like the PLO to a point where, as we saw last December, they were capable of mouthing the words renouncing, as

the gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH], has said, renouncing terrorism, saying the words that they accepted 242 and 338. Unfortunately, although we have been "in discussions," and I say that in quotes because nobody really knows exactly what we are doing there, but although the State Department has been in discussions with the PLO for the last 6 months or so, we have yet to see any tangible, measurable improvement at all in the approach by the PLO to any peace process. We have yet to see any movement at all by that organization in any way in acceptance of the Israeli peace formula, the election plan that we support.

□ 1730

The process has moved even more slowly than a snail's pace. What is unfortunate is that we pushed on Israel, that is the United States pushed on Israel, to come up with a plan such as we announced here in the United States by Prime Minister Shamir. But the result has been that no one has taken up the offer, not one single Arab state, not the PLO, not anyone has put their first foot forward on the issue. That is very disturbing to us. We have seen the State Department talk in context of these discussion with known terrorists, with the No. 2 man at the PLO who is wanted in Italy on an extraditable offense of terrorism.

So we are beginning to wonder where we are going on this issue.

Let me read to you something that I think all of us are interested in, a letter sent by the chairman of the PLO, Yasser Arafat, to the communist general secretary, Jiang Zemin. This letter reads, in part:

... On behalf of the Arab Palestinian people and their leadership, and myself, I express the warmest, most sincere congratulations to you—dear comrade—on your appointment to General Secretary of the CPC, and take this opportunity to express our extreme gratification that the friendly People's China has restored normal order after the recent incidents.

This was Arafat in the People's Daily, Hong Kong, June 27, 1989.

So we see positions taken by the PLO directly opposed to the positions enunciated not only on the floor of this House but from the President of the U.S. And we have to do more to bring this group back to where they ought to be.

Israel is open to schools, Israel would like to do a lot more. We need, because we are in discussions with the PLO, to be pushing them as much as we are pushing everyone else in this process. Ultimately this bill strikes a good balance.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the subcommittee, Mr. McHUGH, the chairman and others who have wanted to strike this balance to continue this evenhanded approach of the United

States Government to the peace process.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], for their dedicated work on what is often a very controversial bill.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we have produced is a good bipartisan effort to promote our country's security and long-term sustainable development interests around the world.

This bill is within the summit agreement and, with our \$59 million ESF recission, meets our Budget Committee target.

The administration is especially pleased that there is maximum flexibility in our aid programs with only four countries, including Israel, earmarked for military and economic aid. Development aid is also flexible with only funding for voluntary family planning receiving its own line item.

Mr. OBEY and Mr. EDWARDS, have worked closely to provide additional FMS funding in the bill. Their agreement means that the United States will be able to provide security assistance to over a dozen friends and allies that otherwise would have been cut.

Our commitment to democracy in Central America has been maintained. Aid to Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador is under the administration's control, at their discretion to respond to events as they unfold. We were especially pleased that aid to El Salvador was not provided in installments.

While we did not provide the full funding requested for the Philippine Multilateral Assistance Initiative [MAI], we came a long way in a difficult budgetary situation with 80 percent of the request at \$160 million.

The committee also provided the full administration request for programs that enjoy broad support such as the Peace Corps, Anti-terrorism Assistance, Migration and Refugee Assistance, and International Narcotics Control. We also rightly rejected the dramatic cut proposed for UNICEF.

Even in the area of the Multilateral Lending Agencies, including the World Bank Group, we strongly moved in the direction of the private sector by providing funding to the International Finance Corporation while zeroing out the hard loan window of the World Bank. Let me talk specifically about IFC.

I was especially pleased to have the committee provide \$88 million for the International Finance Corporation [IFC] of the World Bank. While other World Bank loans to foreign governments have been called into question, the IFC enjoys broad bipartisan support because it directly supports the fledgling private sector of many Third

World countries. While many government-sponsored projects fall victim to poor planning and bureaucracy, majority shares in IFC projects are always privately held and managed. In short, they work, they are not mismanaged and they sustain and grow through the profit motive. To date, the IFC continues to turn a profit even in the poorest countries.

#### POPULATION

I was pleased to see the committee provided the full request for population. These funds were appropriated as the authorizers required in its own separate line item. Nothing is more important to stopping environmental degradation and providing for the economic future of each individual than voluntary family planning.

#### AIDS

The committee continued its response to the devastating spread of the AIDS virus worldwide. To date, up to 50 million people are at risk in Africa alone. Some areas report infection rates of 20 to 30 percent. The committee funded the AIDS account at the full request level with a commitment to move toward an equal balance between AID and WHO in the future.

#### GLOBAL WARMING

One of the most pressing new issues facing us is global warming. In this bill we have recommended a doubling of AID's Office of Energy and directed them to move their office's mission to a global warming initiative fostering development through greater efficiency, the use of renewable energy sources and a focus on technologies that do not contribute to global warming.

#### PHILIPPINE MAI

While we did not provide the full funding that the administration requested for the Philippine Multilateral Assistance Initiative [MAI], I believe that the committee did its best with an initial appropriation of \$160 million. This is only the first installment in a multi-year plan. As this program continues, we will obviously respond with greater funding if the program really takes off and improves the Philippine economy.

#### HONG KONG

I was also pleased to note the inclusion of "sense of the Congress" language that urged the President to forcefully express our interest to the British Government in the development of strong and full democratic institutions in Hong Kong, which is slated for Chinese Communist control in 1992. While the Chinese have promised "one country, two systems," strong democratic institutions in Hong Kong will help to ensure that that promise is kept.

#### CYPRUS

We also maintained commitment to a united Cyprus by providing \$15 mil-

lion in aid, with \$5 million for face-to-face bicomunal projects. Last night, the Congressional Human Rights Caucus sponsored the first ever Greek and Turkish Cypriot bicomunal art exhibit that united the work of children from both sides. At this moment several hundred Greek Cypriot women are occupying a church inside the Green Line that divides Greek Cypriot and Turkish forces. Both armies are on alert and the situation is tense. Times like this show that the situation on Cyprus remains tense and needs our attention. These projects are urgently needed to reduce that tension.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill would be impossible to produce without the help of dedicated and professional staff. I want to commend Terry Peel, Bill Schuerch, Mark Murray, and Lori Maes for their long hours and patient work on the subcommittee. I also want to thank Jim Fairchild, Letitia Hoadley, Steve Goose, Adele Liskov, and Gary Bombardier. Special notice must be given to several newcomers to the subcommittee including Donna Mullins with Mr. GALLO, Georgia Sambunaris on loan from AID, and especially, Mr. Chairman, Chris Walker with MICKEY EDWARDS who has done an outstanding job on his first bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations and a resident expert on Afghanistan.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman and Members, first of all I think it is altogether fitting that we are having these discussions tonight and I think it is altogether fitting that we are discussing the Middle East.

The United States has invested billions of dollars in the last 10 years in the Middle East, dollars in Jordan, dollars in Egypt, dollars in Israel.

Thirty billion dollars of it has gone to Israel alone.

As a matter of fact, we provide Israel with \$3 billion a year and Egypt with \$2.3 billion a year making up almost a third of the disposable funds of this bill.

□ 1740

As is well-known, the United States also provides, particularly Israel, with military support, as with the airlift in 1973 and 1974, and with political support in the United Nations and in other world forums.

Our Government shoulders this burden gladly and asks very little in return. We remember very well the horrors that caused the State of Israel to be created, and we also admire the ingenuity and courage of the gifted Is-

raeli people, the courage that has enabled them to defend themselves in four wars, and in not much peace since the existence of that state.

We also now realize that there is another presence west of the Jordan River that warrants our interest, that is the Palestinian people who have carried out a bloody uprising for over 1 year at a cost of hundreds of deaths to themselves and many Israeli deaths, as well. It is in our interest and, indeed, in the interest of the world, that a just peace come to that troubled land.

In this light, most Members applauded the peace plan as mentioned by the gentleman from Florida, that was brought to this country in the late spring by Prime Minister Shamir. We liked the idea of elections among the Palestinians, and we hope that the details of these elections would be such as to cause the elections to take place in successful negotiations to follow.

I call upon both sides to go forward with these election plans. I call upon the PLO to publicly embrace them. I particularly urge that neither side place preconditions on the elections which obviously will prevent them from taking place.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to take the well to strongly support the foreign aid appropriations legislation and to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for the thoughtful work that they have done in drafting a very balanced and important piece of legislation. I believe that this is a good bill, and it is one that accomplishes, on a bipartisan basis, as a number of Members have mentioned, a number of important foreign policy objectives of the United States.

Several weeks ago, as my colleagues well know, the House overwhelmingly passed the Foreign aid authorization bill. It was enacted by the largest margin ever, and it was a bipartisan vote which I believe clearly shows the depth of support for at least the essence, if not a number of the details, of our foreign assistance program.

I very much hope and I urge my colleagues to demonstrate the same type of support for the appropriation measure that will appropriate the funds pursuant to the authorization measure.

I would like to spend a few moments discussing some of the points pertaining to the Middle East, talking about some of the points that have been raised, thoughtfully and eloquently, by my colleagues before me. My colleague just before me, my very good friend from Texas, Mr. WILSON, for whom I have the utmost respect and

affection, focused on the resources that go to the Middle East, and focused appropriately on the resources that go to the Middle East, and I think that we all understand that the Middle East receives the greatest proportion of our foreign aid dollars. I for one would very much like to see additional resources in other parts of the world. I know that is a view that is shared by members of the subcommittee. I believe that it would be one of the finer accomplishments between the legislative and executive branches working together if resources could be found that would increase the ability of this Congress to fund more fully other extremely worthwhile programs on other continents that are very much in the interest of the United States.

At the same time, the reasons are quite clear, they have been spelled out by speakers before me, including my friend from Texas and by others, in terms of why the resources that do go to the Middle East are intended in that fashion. It is a region of vital importance to the United States. Israel and Egypt are close diplomatic and strategic allies of this country and other countries in the region, Jordan, Oman, and others, who have been recipient of resources from other countries, are deserving of these resources, and support for the Middle East peace process is an essential goal of American diplomacy. Support for the safety and for the security of Israel is of vital concern to the United States, and even in the face of a vexing diplomatic dilemma, how best to promote Middle East peace, and in the face of recent events, it is important that we not forget or overlook this fundamental fact.

Much has been said and written in the 20 months about the Palestinian uprising and the Israeli response, and I would like to spend a few minutes offering at least some of my own perspective on the subject. Israel has been faced since December 1987 with an extraordinarily difficult dilemma, one faced by any democracy in a similar situation which is, in essence, how to control, without using excessive force, protesters in which the participants are not carrying placards, but instead are throwing rocks, Molotov cocktails, knives, chains, acid, and other items which are clearly meant to maim and to kill. These are not placards, these are not peaceful demonstrators.

Surely, the imperative in the solution, as a number of Members have emphasized, most recently again my colleague from Texas, is peace, which can only be obtained by diplomacy. Israel's Prime Minister Shamir recently proposed a plan for elections in the West Bank and Gaza which represents a very important, very significant, and very solid starting point for moving

the process forward. As Secretary of State Baker indicated as recently as last night, the Shamir plan offers great promise for progress on Mideast peace, and for bringing Israelis and Palestinians together in a negotiating process. Even in the aftermath of the Likud convention, as Secretary Baker emphasized appropriately yesterday, the Shamir plan is alive and well. The conditions are not helpful, but neither are they binding upon the Government any more than the Democratic or Republican Party platforms being binding on Members of their respective parties in this well.

Indeed, the view of the Bush administration, and I believe it is an appropriate and accurate view, is that there is no change in the Shamir plan, and that it continues to represent, as Secretary Baker stated, "The best thing we've got going for peace in the Middle East." It is important for both sides to engage in this plan, and to engage in it with a minimum, hopefully, no preconditions.

However, I think we should also remember that, unfortunately, at this point in time, while there are no preconditions that have yet been established by the Israeli Government, and I hope there will not be such, there have, thus far, been preconditions established by the PLO, and I hope that these will be dropped. The PLO says at this point that the starting point for negotiations is that Israel accept a Palestinian state, and that Israel accept Jerusalem as their capital. As the Bush administration has emphasized, these preconditions are a non-starter, and they should be scrapped.

Nevertheless, despite the PLO's setting forth these preconditions, Israel remains in the peace process, willing to engage in discussions with responsible Palestinians. Yet those Palestinians who have shown any indication that they are willing to live in peace with Israel have been assassinated by extremists in the territories, and I believe that we should focus our attention on the campaign of assassination and intimidation which has, tragically, muted the voice for peace to a great extent on the West Bank and Gaza. Sadly, as well, PLO conduct since Geneva, through both statements and actions have, so far, badly undermined the stated commitment to peace and against terror.

Ultimately, the PLO must convince Israel that the PLO is serious about peace, because Israel is the key to any territorial solution. Sadly, the PLO has consistently given Israel every reason to doubt their ultimate intentions. Just because Israel will not accept the PLO's prescription for peace does not mean Israel rejects peace. To the contrary, as I think my colleagues well understand, history has been replete with examples of

Israel offering an outreached hand to the Arabs, such as the Shamir plan, which the Arabs have consistently rejected.

It is my hope that all of my colleagues must understand that the onus must be on the Arab side to show they are serious about peace, as Israel has shown in offering the Shamir plan.

□ 1750

One regret that I have is that thus far the administration appears to have spent more time pressuring Israel than the PLO, despite the fact that as Assistant Secretary of State Kelly testified last week, the dialog between the United States and the PLO has thus far produced nothing from the PLO for the United States.

Such a strategy boosts the PLO and has so far given us nothing in return. In fact, a negotiating strategy which pressures Israel more than it pressures the PLO eliminates any incentive the PLO might have to support the Shamir plan. It causes the PLO to believe that inaction on its part will simply cause more pressure to the Israelis.

This is a mistaken negotiating strategy. Thus far the public statements that this administration has consistently made with regard to its support for the Shamir plan are welcome. They should be the thrust, they should be the focal point, they should be the consistent approach in the region. This is a plan that offers hope, and this is a plan that offers promise. I hope that we will be focusing our efforts and the administration will focus its efforts on bringing the Arab states to the peace table and on bringing West Bank and Gaza Palestinians into the process without fear for their lives.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my friends on both sides of the aisle for this debate. I think it has been useful and constructive, and I urge support for this bill in the strongest possible terms.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this is a unique occasion. There is not a great deal of controversy on a bill which is very important, a bill which is critical to our relationships with our allies around the world, a bill which has the potential of greatly helping our alliances throughout the world. We have been able to work together to arrive at a consensus opinion, with the support of not only the Democrats and the Republicans on the committee but also all parts of the administration.

As the vice chairman of that subcommittee, I would like to compliment the subcommittee chairman, the gen-

tleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and the other Members on both sides of the aisle who worked so hard to make that happen. We had a couple of markups. It was not easy getting to the point at which we are now, but I would just briefly say that in terms of putting together a package that provides for the security assistance necessary to help our allies, the military assistance programs that are trying to help the Philippines in restructuring their economy and doing those kinds of things which are in the best national interest of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we have come a long way, and I would hope there would be a great deal of support for this bill on both sides of the aisle, and that it will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the budget issues involved with this appropriations bill, we have provided that information on all the appropriations bills, and I want to continue to do that. We have provided a "Dear Colleague" to all Members.

There are no Budget Act waivers required for this bill because it has budget authority and outlays equal to the discretionary targets established under the section 302 subdivision assigned to the subcommittee of the Committee of Appropriations.

In total, the bill provides \$13.5 billion in discretionary budget authority and \$11.5 billion in discretionary outlays. Both are equal to the budget authority and outlays in the subdivision.

This is incidentally the second largest cut of any appropriation from the administration's request, and obviously it was an important subject in the budget summit and budget agreement where we established caps with regard to foreign aid functions. The bill is consistent with both the budget resolution and the bipartisan budget agreement worked out with the administration, and for these reasons there are really no budget problems with H.R. 2939.

This subcommittee, which is the fifth subcommittee bringing its appropriation bills to the floor, has done an excellent job in meeting the targets established under the budget resolution. I want to congratulate both the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and all the Members for what is often the thankless job of trying to develop a consensus on foreign aid.

This bill is supported on both sides of the aisle, by the President, the Department of State, and the Department of the Treasury. It is the type of consensus that is very difficult to arrive at, and I think it is testimony to the work of the chairman, the mem-

bers of the subcommittee, and the staffs. I want to congratulate all of them.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to urge support for this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the budget issues involved with this appropriation bill, we have provided a "Dear Colleague" to all Members. There are no budget act waivers required for this bill because it provides budget authority and outlays equal to the discretionary targets established under this section 302 subdivision assigned to this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

In total, this bill provides \$13,550 million in discretionary budget authority and \$11,550 million in discretionary outlays. Both are equal to the discretionary budget authority and outlays in the subdivision.

The bill, therefore, is consistent with both the budget resolution and the bipartisan budget agreement worked out with the administration. For these reasons, there are no budget problems with H.R. 2939.

This subcommittee, the fifth subcommittee bringing its appropriations bill to the floor, has done a good job in meeting the targets established under the budget resolution. We congratulate Chairman OBEY and the other members of the subcommittee for the often thankless job of consensus building on foreign aid. This bill is supported by both sides of the aisle, the President, the Department of State, and the Department of Treasury. This type of consensus is difficult to arrive at and is a testimony to the hard work by this subcommittee and staff. We congratulate them and we are pleased to bring this information to the attention of the Members.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,

Washington, DC, July 20, 1989.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Attached is a fact sheet on H.R. 2939, Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 1990. This bill is scheduled for floor consideration on Friday, July 21, subject to a rule being adopted.

This is the fifth appropriations bill for fiscal year 1990 and is equal to the Appropriations Committee 302(b) subdivision in both budget authority and outlays for this subcommittee. Therefore, it is consistent with the 1990 Budget Resolution and the Bipartisan Budget Agreement.

I hope this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,  
Chairman.

[Factsheet]

H.R. 2939, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1990 (H. REPT. 101-165)

The House Appropriations Committee reported the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1990 on Wednesday, July 19, 1989. This bill is scheduled for floor action on Friday, July 21, subject to a rule being adopted.

COMPARISON TO THE 302(b) SUBDIVISION

The bill provides \$13,550 million of discretionary budget authority and \$11,550 million of discretionary outlays, both equal to

the subdivision for this subcommittee. A detailed comparison of the bill to the spending and credit allocations follows:

## COMPARISON TO SPENDING ALLOCATION

(In millions of dollars)

	Foreign operations appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 302(b) subdivision		Bill over (+) / under (-) 302(b) subdivision	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Discretionary.....	13,550	11,550	13,550	11,550		
Mandatory <sup>1</sup> .....	805	805	805	805		
Total.....	14,355	12,355	14,355	12,355		

<sup>1</sup> Conforms to budget resolution estimates of existing law.

Note: BA—New budget authority; O—Estimated outlays.

The direct loan levels in the bill are equal to the discretionary subdivision for this subcommittee. The primary guarantees are \$4 million under the subdivision. A detailed comparison follows:

## COMPARISON TO CREDIT ALLOCATION

	Foreign operations appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 302(b) subdivision		Bill over (+) / under (-) 302(b) subdivision	
	DL	LG	DL	LG	DL	LG
Discretionary.....	1,071	6,410	1,071	6,414		-4
Mandatory.....						
Total.....	1,071	6,410	1,071	6,414		-4

Note: DL—New direct loan obligations; LG—New loan guarantee commitments.

Pursuant to Section 302(b) of the 1974 Budget Act as amended by P.L. 99-177 (Gramm-Rudman-Hollings), the Committees of the House are required to subdivide the spending authority and credit authority allocated to them in the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 1989 (shown in H. Rept. 100-662). The Appropriations Committee reported its 302(b) subdivisions on June 10, 1988. These subdivisions are the official score-keeping targets for appropriations subcommittees.

The following are the major program highlights for the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for FY 1990, as reported:

## PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	New outlays
Multilateral Economic Assistance.....	1,873	217
International Financial Institutions.....	(1,603)	(44)
International Organizations and Programs.....	(270)	(173)
Bilateral Economic Assistance.....	6,320	2,758
Economic Support Assistance.....	(2,104)	(1,612)
Military Assistance.....	5,504	2,662
Foreign Military Sales.....	(4,664)	(1,861)
Direct Loan.....		(450)
Export Assistance.....	645	118
Export Import Bank.....	(615)	(90)
Direct Loan.....		(595)
Primary Guarantees.....		<sup>1</sup> (10,384)

<sup>1</sup> The limit recommended by the House Appropriations Committee exceeds the CBO estimate of market demand for these guarantees which is estimated at \$6,050 million.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Development, Finance, Trade and

Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY].

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the foreign aid appropriations bill before the House today. The subcommittee chairman, Mr. OBEY, has done a tremendous job reconciling the many competing interests under most difficult circumstances. It is a thankless task to make do with less, knowing that many important and worthy foreign policy interests of the United States cannot be funded as they deserve to be.

As long as the administration continues to believe that we can meet deficit reduction goals solely through spending reductions, we will be faced with the inevitable inability to meet our obligations around the world.

As chairman of the authorizing subcommittee with jurisdiction over U.S. participation in the multilateral financial institutions, I would like to focus on one particular aspect of the bill.

Last year, the Congress passed legislation authorizing participation in a general capital increase for the World Bank. The Banking and Appropriations Committees worked closely together in crafting that important piece of legislation. At that time each committee registered strong dissatisfaction with the Third World debt strategy then in place. However, our view that a strongly capitalized World Bank would be central to a solution to the debt and development problem superseded doubts about the wisdom of passing the GCI at that time.

There is now a new debt strategy emphasizing debt reduction known as the Brady initiative. I am supportive of the Brady debt initiative. The new debt initiative places the emphasis where it should have been a long time ago—on debt and debt service reduction. The Baker plan instead had emphasized new commercial bank lending and, as many of us predicted, such new lending was simply not forthcoming.

As a strong supporter of the World Bank it may not seem consistent then that I support no new funding of the World Bank at this time. The reason has nothing to do with lack of support for the Brady initiative or the World Bank. It has everything to do with seeking to ensure that the Brady initiative is successful.

Large amounts of World Bank and IMG resources have been pledged in support of debt reduction. This is a key ingredient to ensuring that meaningful debt reduction is achieved. However, success and the relative risk to the American taxpayer will be determined by the amount of discount the commercial banks agree to accept on their outstanding LDC loans. If we are to back debt and debt service reduction with public resources through the

international institutions, that reduction must be on a scale sufficient to generate growth in the debtor countries.

Until we see a deal on the table for Mexico and other countries which shows us that the commercial banks are willing to accept sufficiently large discounts from par we should not underwrite a debt rescheduling agreement in advance of the fact. The Treasury, as instructors to the U.S. representatives at the IMF and World Bank, must not allow an agreement to be consummated which does not adequately protect the financial integrity of the international institutions and ultimately the American taxpayer.

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, it would be my strong hope and desire that by the time this bill before us goes to conference, the Brady initiative will have a proven track record. I hope that we will have seen a rescheduling for Mexico and one or two other countries which provides meaningful debt and debt service reduction. It must be an agreement where the commercial banks have shouldered their large share of the burden primarily through debt reduction rather than more of the same in the form of new lending. Should such a scenario develop between now and conference, I believe that reconsideration of the decision on funding for the World Bank would be appropriate.

□ 1800

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 11 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to follow up on the discussion on the Middle East that we have had with the gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] and others, and I think this is a good opportunity for me to respond to a question that I am often asked.

Mr. Chairman, I am often asked by people here and at home why we provide \$3 billion a year to Israel and such a huge amount to Egypt. The answer is simply that this country made a commitment at Camp David at the time we helped create the conditions for that agreement, and out of that Camp David settlement came this annual request for funding on the part of whomever is President.

Now, whenever that is said, some people will say, "Well, yes, but, after all, we've had trouble on the West Bank. We now have the uprising on the West Bank." They will point out that there appears to have been an effort on the part of some recently to severely limit the ability of the Shamir election plan to get off the

ground, and the question comes: "Why not, therefore, cut aid to Israel?"

Mr. Chairman, I think there are many answers for that. My own answer is very simple. I think that when the United States supported the creation of Israel as a state some 40 years ago we took on not only international political obligations, but took on some moral obligations as well, and one of those obligations was to see to it that a state which we were helping to create was in fact not driven into oblivion by various forces at work throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I also think that another reason is simply no one can demonstrate that any reduction in the support for Israel would in fact add any clarity to the political discussion within that country on the problems which confront them with respect to peace with their neighbors and with the Palestinians.

I think that the discussion that we have had, although it has been brief, has been useful.

I think that any fair assessment of what has happened over the last 20 years would simply have to indicate that we have had 20 years of missed opportunities. And, if we are to avoid continued missed opportunities, we are going to have to have a greater sense of realism and flexibility on the part of the Arabs and the Palestinians. In addition, we are going to have to have a greater sense of vision on the part of the Israelis.

Mr. Chairman, I remember at the time of Camp David when we were on the White House lawn celebrating that event, and I ran into Herman Eilts who was Ambassador to Egypt. I said, "Tell me, Herman, do you think this is a separate peace for Israel and Egypt, or do you think it is going to lead to something more than that for the entire region?"

He said, "You know, I think that really depends upon the Arabs. I think it depends on how they play it."

The week afterward I had a number of officials from the Syrian Embassy in my office discussing the Dasmascan water project which was being funded by the United States at that time, and I suggested to them that it was in their interest to support the Camp David process and to try to flesh it out and make it real in terms of a long-term settlement. They responded that they did not feel they could do that because they felt that a 5-year time period, a 5-year transition period before they moved to final resolution of the problems, was too long a period to wait.

So, Mr. Chairman, that opportunity was missed. And so now it has been 10 years, and there has still been no progress, and no peace and no gain. And I would submit that all of the parties are worse off today than they were a few years ago. We now have

had 10 years more tension, 10 years more terrorism, 10 years which has worn down the tolerance of both sides. Certainly it has in Israel. And that 10 additional years has increased the audience for extremism.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say the question is not what should be done about past injustices in that region. The question is: What will be done about today's opportunities in order to shape tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are not going to see much progress on that subject unless facts of history are accepted by both sides. And so, as one Member of Congress, I would simply appeal to American citizens to recognize that the United States has a special relationship with Israel which should and will continue. But I would also appeal to people to recognize that it is definitely in the United States' interest to have strong relations with Arab States in that region as well.

I would suggest to the Palestinians that they can do no good by refusing to recognize that their greatest enemy is fear. And if the words, and if the conduct, and if the interpretation of history put forward by the Palestinians and by the Arab world results in their being painted as unreliable partners in peace, then no real progress is going to be made.

In Israel I would simply say that, if the goal is to crush or defeat the intifada rather than quelling it, and calming it and turning it into something constructive, then that, too, will result in a loss for Israel over the long term.

I think it is not legitimate; in fact it is outrageous, for the PLO to threaten the lives of Palestinians who suggest cooperation with Israel. And I think it is not legitimate for PLO officials to refuse to commit to the permanence of Israel. And I think it is not smart for them to encourage violence. The intifada has made its point. I think that if at this point its hand is overplayed, they will lose the game, and I think any Arab leader or Palestinian leader who does not recognize that is foolish.

I would say that there are considerable illegitimacies on the Israeli side as well. It is not legitimate; in fact it is outrageous, for one Israeli politician to call for the elimination or the assassination of Palestinian leaders. It is certainly not legitimate in my view to bulldoze houses without due process, or to imprison Palestinians without due process. And it is not smart, and it is not thinking about the long-term results to try to set conditions on the Shamir plan which would guarantee the failure of that plan.

Mr. Chairman, everybody has their own experiences with constituencies. My experience has been that there has been no ethnic group, no religious group in this country that has had or that has demonstrated a greater degree of tolerance and greater sup-

port for justice through our history than have members of the American Jewish community. I think that Israeli policy that departs from that tradition would be gravely misguided, and I think that Palestinian policy that would drive Israel into departing from that tradition is historically tragic and is a monumental mistake.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would simply join those today who have asked both sides to look for opportunities to try to reach accommodation rather than to continue to look for excuses not to. I would urge that we, to the greatest extent possible, support the efforts of our own administration to move both sides toward negotiations with each other. I think that it is essential.

Mr. Chairman, I gave a speech to the Arab American Conference several weeks ago, and I urged them to support the Shamir plan as the only ball game in town if they really want to pursue peace. And I would say the same thing to the members of the American Jewish community, or, for that matter, any citizen of Israel. I would say that the most constructive thing that can be done, if we want to keep our eye on the long-term interests of Israel and the long-term ability of the entire region to achieve peace, is to support and to flesh out the Shamir plan rather than putting impediments in its way or putting conditions in its way which would guarantee that it could not succeed.

□ 1810

Mr. Chairman, I would simply suggest that we cannot afford more missed opportunities. We cannot afford anyone on either side who thinks with their spleen. We have to have calm thought and a rational focus on how the status quo will endanger everyone if it is not changed by moving toward, rather than away from peaceful solutions.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman on his very thoughtful statement. This is a statement that reflects years of being intimately involved in this process from a unique position. It was a wise, balanced and thoughtful statement, that I personally welcome and I commend to the attention of my colleagues and people who are interested in this subject, and I want to compliment the gentleman on his remarks today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the foreign operations appropriation bill. First, I would like to thank Chairman WHITTEN and Chairman OBEY for their dedicated work

on this important bill. I would also like to thank the staff for its wonderful work.

In particular, I would like to thank the distinguished subcommittee Chairman OBEY for including an earmark of \$7.5 million in economic support and development assistance for humanitarian aid for the people in Lebanon. This aid is critical to the Lebanese people and to Lebanon's survival as a democratic nation. I hope that the foreign operations bill in the other body will also include this vitally needed aid.

Now, more than ever before, America must remain committed to the restoration of Lebanon's unity, sovereignty, integrity, and independence. Since the hostilities escalated in March, over 392 people have been killed and over 1,293 people have been wounded. Such basic commodities as water and food are very scarce. There is only one to two hours of electricity a day because there is little to no fuel and because so many powerplants have been hit by the heavy shelling.

In one night in April, on April 4, over 5,000 shells hit the Christian areas alone, and the New York Times reported that on that night Muslim districts were hit by over 3,000 shells.

I know of few other nations who have suffered as much as Lebanon. In 1985, annual per capita income was \$700, a decline of more than 50 percent since 1974. According to the Lebanese Economic Report, a book which was published in 1986, Lebanon is now classified as one of the poorer Third World countries, whereas in the pre-war years its economic performance had propelled it up to the ranks of developed countries. In the same report, it stated that civil strife had led to a 30-percent unemployment rate.

Given the desperate situation in Lebanon, I have been deeply distressed that our Nation's support in economic support assistance for that strife-torn nation has been so low.

The Agency for International Development estimates that in fiscal year 1989 we will spend only \$300,000 in economic support funds for Lebanon.

I am deeply gratified to see that, with the earmark for humanitarian aid for Lebanon, the United States will resume its leadership role in Lebanon.

I thank the subcommittee chairman and the other committee members for their diligent work. I urge final passage of the bill.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. ECKART, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2939) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other pur-

poses, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2939, and that I may be permitted to include charts, tables, and other material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### VACATING SPECIAL ORDER AND REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may vacate a 30-minute special order reserved for me for today and in lieu thereof substitute a 5-minute special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### PALAUAN DRUG ARRESTS VINDICATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE POSITIONS

(Mr. DE LUGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, last week, some three dozen people were arrested by Federal agents in connection with trafficking heroin and cocaine in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands of Palau. Among the dozen or so arrested in Palau were two former members of Palau's Congress who had been close to former Palau President Lazarus Salii.

These arrests vindicate positions that I and other members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee have taken regarding drug abuse in Palau.

They support the findings of our investigation that Palau's drug abuse problem is serious and that some Palauan officials were allegedly involved.

The arrests also respond to our repeated calls for the Federal Government to live up to its responsibility to combat drug abuse in Palau.

Perhaps most important, they justify our insistence that Palau be given help to tackle this serious problem through the legislation to give final U.S. approval to the Compact of Free Association with Palau.

The new Secretary of the Interior, our former colleague Manuel Lujan, deserves credit for helping to end the policy of inaction on Federal law enforcement responsibilities in Palau.

Palau's new President, Ngirratkel Etpison, and police should also be rec-

ognized for their cooperation with the crackdown.

It was carried out by Drug Enforcement Administration, Customs Service, and Immigration and Naturalization Services agents; Coast Guard personnel; and Guam police and customs officers, all of whom deserve recognition as well.

Let me provide some background to help Members understand the significance of the operation and how it relates to concerns we have expressed and legislation we have acted upon.

Last year, Chairman UDALL and I said that one of our concerns about the legislation proposed by President Reagan to authorize the compact to be put into effect related to high rates of drug abuse in Palau and allegations that some high officials were involved with the trafficking.

We said that this problem should be investigated and acted upon by the administration. In part, this was because the United States is responsible for preventing narcotics trafficking in Palau under the trusteeship agreement with the United Nations Security Council. The executive branch is fully responsible for Palau under law, a responsibility that has been delegated to the Interior Department. In part, we called for action because the trafficking was smuggling dangerous drugs into U.S. territory.

We also said that the final approval of the compact should assure that this problem would be tackled. Our position in this regard was supported by a majority of Palau's Congress.

Our concern was based on information developed through an investigation by the Insular and International Affairs Subcommittee, which I am privileged to chair. The drug abuse component of this investigation was prompted by allegations made by leaders of Palau's Congress.

In response to an inquiry we made in 1987, we were told by the then Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration that the number of the 15,000 people of Palau that had used heroin may run into the hundreds; that marijuana is grown freely in Palau; and that local authorities could not prevent this abuse.

This report was corroborated by a World Health Organization report that heroin, which had first entered Palau only 5 years before, had been used by over a hundred Palauans; by published reports quoting Palauan officials as saying that drug abuse was the islands' greatest social problem and that marijuana trafficking was substantial; as well as by statements by diverse Palauan sources. Many of these statements also identified the two then Palauan legislators close to then President Salii as being among those involved.

The concern that Chairman UDALL and I, and members of Palau's Congress, expressed was strongly criticized by officials of the Reagan administration and persons close to Salii. They resisted our efforts for Federal action and our proposals for addressing this problem through the compact legislation. They asserted that the problem was not so serious and not a Federal responsibility. They objected to us raising this matter in connection with the compact legislation and rejected the notion that senior Palauan officials were involved.

After President Salii committed suicide last August Salii's successor united with the majority of Palau's Congress in expressing concerns similar to those we had expressed. Later, after failing to force us to approve the compact legislation without addressing drug abuse and other problems, the Reagan administration finally agreed to our proposals for the help that Palau needed to tackle these problems.

This assistance, included in the compact legislation which repassed the House on June 27, would provide Palau with \$400,000 per year for 5 years and technical assistance for substance abuse prevention and treatment and other law enforcement. House Joint Resolution 175 would also ensure that Federal law enforcement agents can do their job in Palau in cooperation with Palauan authorities.

As I said at the outset, last week's arrests justify our fight, and that of courageous leaders in Palau's Congress like Senate President Joshua Koshiba and former House Speaker Santos Oli-kong, for a war against drug abuse in Palau.

A State Department cable makes it clear that in spite of what we were told by officials of the last administration, DEA agents were investigating Palauan drug rings since at least the time that we raised the issue.

#### TRAGEDY OF UNITED FLIGHT 232 AT SIOUX CITY, IA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, tragedy struck yesterday in Sioux City, IA, when United flight 232, enroute from Denver to Chicago, made an ill-fated emergency landing. It was an afternoon of horror, but hope came with the disaster relief effort.

Literally hundreds of rescuers raced to the airport once they were notified via an emergency network that the pilot was having difficulties. Anticipating the worst, a medevac helicopter hovered in the air and a ground relief force assembled near the airport as the plane attempted its landing.

The rescue effort was phenomenal once the tragedy occurred. The 185th Tactical Squadron of the Iowa National Guard, standing by with other evacuation helicopters, went

immediately into action. Ambulances from Sioux City and communities within a radius of 50 miles rushed onto the scene. Hospitals, from as far as 100 miles away in Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota, sent emergency equipment. Governor Branstad of Iowa, Governor Orr of Nebraska, and Governor Mickelson of South Dakota immediately mustered all resources at their disposal to assist in the rescue.

Within 1 hour, those that needed medical attention were taken to either St. Luke's Regional Medical Center, which has a fully equipped burn center, or the Marian Health Center of Sioux City. In a spontaneous burst of compassion for persons injured in the crash, more than 400 persons turned out to give blood at the Siouxland Community Blood Bank by 8 o'clock that evening.

Largely responsible for the rescue effort, which helped turn a horrific event into a miracle in which, at latest count, approximately 187 of the 298 passengers and crew survived, was the Woodbury County Disaster Committee. Using predesigned disaster plans, the committee was able to coordinate the response of police, airport rescue teams, fire departments, ambulance squads, hospitals, and many others in the aftermath of the crash.

A local college even threw open its doors to the survivors. An estimated 75 to 100 flight 232 passengers were allowed to settle themselves, make phone calls to their families, and spend the night at Briar Cliff College in Sioux City.

The crash of United flight 232 was a tragic event and our prayers and condolences go out to those who lost their loved ones. At the same time, our thanks and utmost admiration go to the hundreds of professionals and volunteers in Siouxland who banded together to help turn horror into hope.

#### GANDER, NEWFOUNDLAND, CRASH REMAINS A MYSTERY TO CANADIAN AND AMERICAN PUBLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am coming before my colleagues today to bring to their attention a serious matter that has been ignored by our government for the past four years.

I am talking about the tragic plane crash that killed 248 American Soldiers and 8 others at Gander, Newfoundland, in December 1985. We all remember that crash because it was the worst military crash in American peacetime history. Canadians remember the crash because it was the worst air disaster in their history.

The official version of the crash states wing icing, mechanical failures, and human error as the causes of the crash. The Canadian and United States Governments continue to uphold this theory despite contradictory evidence indicating that it could have been the result of a terrorist act.

Even though it was a tragedy of terrific magnitude for both countries, the United States Government deferred all responsibility for the official investigation and report on the crash to the Canadian Government. And yet, the National Transportation Safety Board, the U.S. Army, and the FBI did investigate the scene.

Keep in mind that we are talking about an U.S. civilian plane that was chartered to carry American servicemen and women to an American destination.

At the very least, the official report should have been a joint effort between the Canadians and the Americans. I want to know why it was not.

Why was there such a cynical disregard for the loss of American military lives by the appropriate Federal agencies? And why has there been a callous reluctance to respond to the families of these victims when they have asked U.S. agencies for answers to their many questions?

Recently, too many credible sources have spoken out in support of the theory that the plane may have been the target of a terrorist attack. Allow me to give some examples.

In December 1988, the Canadian Air Safety Board finally released the official report which ruled that the crash was caused by ice contamination. This conclusion was by no means unanimous.

Four of the nine members of the board released a dissenting opinion from which I will quote:

... We cannot agree—indeed, we categorically disagree—with the majority findings... The evidence shows that the Arrow Air DC-8 suffered an on-board fire and a massive loss of power before it crashed... The fire may have been associated with an in-flight detonation from an explosive or incendiary device.

The Airline Pilots Association which re-examined the flight recorder information said that the Canadian report was based on "manufactured data." I quote from the association's report:

This study, contracted by the Canadian Air Safety Board, represents technical dishonesty at its highest.

Many, many other allegations into the faulty investigation and possible coverup by Canadian and American officials have been addressed in the press. I will list just a few which have followed this story: U.S.A. Today, the Army Times, Counter-Terrorism and Security Intelligence, the Ottawa Citizen, the St. Petersburg Times, and Jack Anderson.

It's not only the press that is involved in getting to the bottom of this mess. The Labor Party in Canada has charged that the Canadian Board is involved in a coverup and has demanded a judicial review to include all available evidence and testimony.

The Pennsylvania Senate unanimously passed a resolution on June 28

of this year calling for the United States and Canadian Governments to reopen the investigation.

The bottom line—the Gander crash remains a mystery to the Canadian and American public. Families of these soldiers have suffered too long and have heard too much evidence to indicate that their government is either hiding something from them or is just plain lying to them.

I am submitting for the record a list of over 30 questions written by Mrs. Zona Phillips, of St. Petersburg, FL, the leader of the group Families for the Truth About Gander. I believe that the appropriate U.S. Federal agencies should address these questions with candor and clarity.

I have also written to Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney and Attorney General Richard Thornburgh requesting their full cooperation in answering questions. I am submitting for the record a copy of these letters.

No words can express my gratitude to Constance Farmer and Dana Edmonds, of Hartsville, SC, for bringing this matter to my attention with a very detailed and moving letter which I will also submit for the record. They lost their son and brother Capt. Kyle Edmonds and it is for them and for the other families that I am bringing this matter to my colleagues in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 12, 1989.

HON. RICHARD CHENEY,  
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR DICK: Last week I had a disturbing visit from two constituents who four years ago lost a family member in the tragic crash of the charter plane over Gander, Newfoundland.

The mother and sister of Captain Kyle Edmonds have joined with other families of the 248 peace-keeping soldiers of the 101st Airborne Division who were also killed in an effort to garner more information on the circumstances of the crash. Yet, to this date they have received little response from the government.

Their demand for a full accounting of the investigation comes after several independent investigations have yielded piece-meal, yet substantial evidence which indicates that the plane was the target of a terrorist mission.

Some of the most compelling arguments for this theory come from four members of the Canadian Aviation Safety Board (CASB) who had dissented from the Authority's official report stating that the crash was caused by ice contamination and possibly flight weight and a balance problem. These board members cite physical evidence of an explosion and additional intelligence evidence of the involvement of the alleged terrorist group Islamic Jihad. A recent Washington Post column even opens the theory that the chartered plane may have had some role in the events surrounding the Iran-Contra scandal.

Dick, I am sure that you agree that the relatives of these soldiers deserve to have answers to such questions. It is the responsibility of the government to provide a thorough explanation of the crash that killed their loved ones.

I am requesting from you that the channel of communication be opened between the D.O.D. and these people. It is the very least we can do for the soldiers who died in that tragic crash.

Looking forward to working with you on this very sensitive matter, I am

Sincerely,

ROBIN TALLON,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 1989.

HON. RICHARD THORNBURGH,  
Secretary, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBURGH: I am writing to you regarding the tragic December 1985 crash of the chartered plane carrying 248 American soldiers in Gander, Newfoundland.

Last week the mother and sister of Captain Kyle Edmonds, of Hartsville, South Carolina, who died in the crash, visited my office. My constituents along with the other families of victims have had little success in obtaining information about the crash from the United States government.

Their determination to learn more about the crash has intensified recently with allegations that point to the possibility that the crash may have been caused by a terrorist act. The United States official conclusion concurs with the report by the Canadian Air Safety Board (CASB) that the crash was caused by wing ice contamination and a flight weight and balance problem. However, four of the nine members of the CASB have dissented from their own report.

In addition, a recent Washington Post column further suggests an association of the Gander crash with the Iran-Contra Scandal. In light of these new allegations, the families of these soldiers deserve accessibility to all relevant information about the death of their loved ones.

It is my understanding that the F.B.I. has a report that is largely censored on the Gander crash. I am requesting the pertinent contents of this report be made available to the families. At the very least, I expect that the Justice Department will open the lines of communication with these families and to work with them to see that their many questions are answered once and for all.

Looking forward to working with you on this very critical matter, I am

Sincerely,

ROBIN TALLON,  
Member of Congress.

#### FAMILIES FOR TRUTH ABOUT GANDER

##### QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE GANDER CRASH

1. Why were air charters used rather than military craft? (Who makes that decision and why is it done?)
2. Why was there such lax security on the plane in Cairo and Cologne? (Why leave it to the charter for security?)
3. If charter flights are to be used why not fly them into military bases rather than into regular airports?
4. Why was the baggage security so lax?
5. What was on the cargo manifest (what did the Army load on the plane)? Why wasn't the cargo manifest released (members of the C.A.S.B. did not have it made

available to them.) What is the U.S. Army trying to hide? (What was in the boxes?)

6. How many passengers were onboard the Arrow flight? (One stewardess and pilot who flew the Cairo to Cologne leg, stated that the plane was full. The papers reported for some time after the crash 250 soldiers killed. The autopsy reports listed 258 numbers assigned to bodies and there were two bodies missing from their numbers. This was never adequately explained. Given the time of year, before the holidays, it would seem logical the plane would be full. The soldiers were waiting to get home and some would have been on stand-by, in the event anyone, for any reason, did not take that flight. Where is the passenger manifest?) Who were the other two people on the plane? (256 or 258?)

7. Why did the plane stop in Gander to refuel? Isn't that an unnecessary diversion? Was it to "tanker" fuel and save Arrow air money at the cost of the U.S. Army? Why didn't they fill up in Cologne? Was it because the fuel there is more expensive?

8. Why wasn't the plane maintained more properly?

9. Why all the delays in take-off time?

10. Why weren't the ground crews and maintenance crews questioned in Cairo and Cologne? Who worked on the plane? Who had access to the plane? Were they regular employees or terrorists? Was someone on the plane that should not have been?

11. Why did certain men write or call home and seem upset about something, before the crash? What was wrong? What did they know?

12. Why weren't more Arrow Air pilots questioned? Is it true that Arrow Air was flying into Tehran and Honduras? What for? Were they shipping arms to Iran and the Contras? Where did these arms come from? Were they stockpiled in the Sinai? What was going on at the base in the Sinai?

13. What was the C.I.D. officer bringing home with him? Why did the Pentagon change their story on this man and say that he was only "touring" not assigned in the Sinai, when he was in fact assigned there. Why were members of the 160th task force in the Sinai?

14. Why did Major Crosby order the bulldozing of the crash site the day after the crash, before all the fires were out and all the bodies had been recovered? Was this ordered by the Pentagon? Did the C.A.S.B. or investigators question this request?

15. Why was Arrow Air representatives denied access to the crash site for 9 hours after the crash? Why hasn't the C.A.S.B. commented on this? What was wrong at the crash site they did not want them to see or know?

16. What were the explosions at the crash site after the crash? If there was no arms or explosives aboard, what was it?

17. Why did this particular DC-8 have two additional fire bottles installed in the wheel wells? Was it because the plane was hauling explosives?

17a. Why were the F.B.I. forensic experts denied access to the crash site the entire time they were in Gander? Why did the F.B.I. then say all they did was fingerprint identification and yet they did conduct an investigation (on what was a routine crash) and ask questions pertaining to terrorism. A report was issued some 277 pages long with most blacked out. What is all this about?

18. Why did the C.I.D., D.I.A., C.I.A. and U.S. Army investigate? What did they find? Where is their report? Why wasn't it given

to the Canadian investigators and the C.A.S.B.?

18a. If the N.T.S.B. followed along behind the Canadian investigators why didn't they issue a report. They deny one was done. Why didn't they share their findings with the C.A.S.B.?

19. The F.A.A., the D.O.T., the D.O.D. and others did investigations and reports. Where are they? Why didn't the C.A.S.B. see these? Why all the secrecy if it was a routine flight and ice or mechanical failure caused the crash?

20. Why the cause of ice as the cause of the crash? There are twenty witnesses to prove no ice. Weather readings were taken from data 200 miles away from Gander. Planes that took off and landed before and after the Arrow crashed did not de-ice. They did not crash.

21. Why didn't investigators question people at the crash site? Why did they wait days to do it? Why weren't all witnesses called to testify? Why did they treat witnesses in such a casual manner and dismiss their testimony as statistically unfounded? (imagination?)

22. Why weren't ground crew personnel questioned at the public inquiry? Why weren't their testimonies important? Was it because it had already been decided "ice" would be used as the cause?

23. Why were the claims of responsibility (by terrorists) for the crash, dismissed by the U.S. and Canadian Governments before they investigated, two hours later while the fires were burning? How could they know? Wasn't the claim made by one caller even more astonishing, due to the fact he knew the plane was delayed in Cologne? Why such an obviously flat denial? What were they hiding? Who else besides the F.B.I. investigated this? Why did the State Department alert Egypt Air after the crash telling them to watch out for terrorists? (Egypt Air flies them from the camp to Cairo.)

24. Who investigated the possibility of terrorism in Canada? What expertise do they have in terrorism and bombs?

Where is their report? Why didn't the C.A.S.B. have access to it?

25. Why was the critical evidence withheld from the C.A.S.B. board? (F.B.I. report, autopsy report, cargo and passenger report, aerial photographs of the crash site, and many others.) How can a thorough investigation be done like this? How can it be done without the reports by the American agencies involved? Especially a military plane.

26. The autopsy reports that were done in Canada were based on questionable data. Many leading forensic pathologists disagree on their findings. The toxicological reports did not prove one way or another that there was or was not . . . a precrash fire or explosion aboard the aircraft. Dr. Sheppard in London, a leading forensic pathologist disagreed with A.F.I.P. findings and those in Canada. His report was never considered. Much mystery and many questions lie unanswered concerning the autopsy reports and the toxicology reports.

27. What happened to the cockpit microphone recording? Was it really turned off or did they not want to reveal what was on it?

28. Why did they fabricate the information given to Dayton, Ohio for computer simulated studies? Were they still trying to prove the ice theory? (This has been proven by the U.S. Airline Pilots Association, it was fabricated.)

29. One fire bottle extinguisher was found to have been discharged before impact and the master fire warning lights were found to

be on at time of impact. Why was this key piece of evidence excluded from the investigation? Didn't the fact that the pilot had activated the fire extinguisher and turned on the fire warning light tell them anything?

30. If #4 engine did go in to reverse thrust after take off why did C.A.S.B. investigators dismiss it? Why did they dismiss all the data on this theory that fit the actual pattern of impact perfectly. Was it because they were afraid that the manufacturers would then be involved in the investigation and discover that an explosion caused the engine to go into reverse thrust?

31. Why was Mr. Irving Pinkle's report dismissed outright? (He is a world renowned explosives expert and N.A.S.A. specialist with startling credentials. Why weren't the metal tests done that he ordered? Did R.C.M.P. really expect to find residue on the metal after the plane burned for 20 hours? The plane parts were left in a hanger in piles. Mr. Pinkle still found a section of aircraft that showed definite signs of an explosion. How could they not consider this if this investigation was thorough? Why didn't they put the plane back together? Why did they bury the wreckage before the investigation was completed? Why did they haul plane parts to Scott Air Force Base in Illinois? Why didn't they tell anyone about this? What did they do with these parts there? Where are the reports on this? Why wasn't C.A.S.B. told? Why Scott Air Force Base? Is it because it is M.A.C. headquarters? What reports did M.A.C. issue? Where did they go? Where are the plane parts now?

32. Why was the project to reconstitute the captain's air speed card, that was found on the yolk in a burned condition cancelled in 1987 by the director of investigation? Was he worried that the results would not fit his icing . . . ?

33. If the plane landed as they said it did, rather than blow up, where were the ground scars from the tail section and landing gear? They never found them. Why was the tail section lying in a clump of trees with all the trees around it standing perfectly straight? (If it landed as they said it did.) There was a tree pierced through the tail section that was still standing straight. Part of the fuselage was laying behind the tail section—doesn't that seem odd?

34. In January of 1986, the Army came back and found another body. This after stating that they had found everyone. They collected every scrap they could find, put it all into bags and left. They never came back or were heard from again. Why didn't the investigators examine all of this? In the Pan Am 103 they examined every shred of evidence. They painstakingly checked every fragment. They reconstructed everything they could. Why not in this case? What was different about this crash, that it should have been handled in this way?

35. Firefighters who worked at the crash site and became ill were studied and found to have "post-traumatic stress disorder". They suffer from headaches, nausea, blood and liver problems, and yet they never tested their blood, urine or did x-rays of these people. Why not? This study did nothing for these people nor did it determine what might have been on the plane or caused the crash. Was this another cover-up? You bet. If not this is one more doctored report.

36. Why do the members of the Conservative Party and the Minister of Transportation continually refuse to order a full "judi-

cial inquiry" into the cause of the crash? This was the worst crash in Canadian history. They have called for judicial inquiries in past accidents they had with less loss of life. With the tremendous amount of public pressure and political pressure on them to do so, you have to wonder, why? The truth should fear no trial. The answers are obvious—cover-up.

37. Why the lack of interest in our own Government? No one seems to care and no one wants to be bothered. No one wants to know? They already know. Now we want to know.

There are many more questions. The mystery continues and more doubts surface daily. As an American you have to ask yourself, why 256 Americans died in a foreign land, possibly murdered, wouldn't the President want to know sooner than 3 years later? Would he leave it to the Canadians to muck around for all that time to get the result? Or had it already been decided what the cause would be, so the answers really did not matter . . . we believe so. One small statement sums it up perfectly, "It was an orchestrated litany of lies and fabrication". (Quote: Mr. Ross Stevenson) This was a Canadian and American tragedy, that became a Canadian and American disgrace. Why?

(Dr. and Mrs. J.D. Phillips, founders of Families For Truth About Gander.)

July 20, 1989.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TALLON: We are the mother and sister of Captain Kyle Lee Edmonds who was killed in the Gander, Newfoundland plane crash that happened on December 12, 1985. The Arrow Air Charter crashed on take off, killing all 248 soldiers and 8 crew members on board. Kyle and his comrades were on their way home for Christmas. They had just completed Peace Keeping duties in the Sinai. They were members of the 101st Airborne division out of Ft. Campbell Ky.

We don't know how to tell you the great enormity of the loss our family, has suffered. Kyle was born in Aiken, S.C. and grew up in Hartsville, where he was a graduate of Hartsville High in 1975. Then he went on to graduate from the Citadel with top honors in 1979. He chose the army as his career. He then went to Ft. Benning for Airborne, then on to Ft. Stewart and then Ft. Campbell. He had only been in the army for 3 years before he became Captain. And was up for a promotion upon his arrival home. He dedicated his life to serving his country.

Kyle always said, "Be truthful and stand up for what you believe in." And he believed in his country, so much that he gave his life for it. He loved his family, friends and life as well as he was loved by others. And now this person that we admired and loved has been taken from us. We really can't express how much Kyle meant to us.

But great as his love and dedication was for his job as a military officer, it is now our job as a family to find out the "truth why" we don't have our loved one with us anymore. And we are dedicated to finding the truth no matter how long it takes. We are members of a group called Families for Truth about Gander. At present, there are 75 families and our numbers are growing. This group of families came together in January 1989.

We are currently fighting Two Governments, for a single and rare commodity in today's world: The "Truth" about this tragedy. All of us are average and patriotic Americans. We are not Politicians, Literary experts, Public speakers, Speech writers,

Aviation experts, Investigators, nor are we experienced in Public relations. All of us love America. We gave our loved ones for this country, but we are saddened and concerned about our government and its actions. It is very difficult to understand, how Two Christian, Civilized nations could revere politics more than loss of life and prevention of human suffering. It would appear, that some would serve Politics as their God, rather than the God of our fathers, on whose teachings our countries were founded. Those teachings include: Truth, Justice and Integrity. It is apparent that both countries no longer hold these as sacred.

Whenever you mix politics and Justice, you never get "True" Justice! We think that both Canada and the United States are well aware of the "True" cause of the Gander crash, but for reasons which are beyond our comprehension, they have continued to perpetrate a deception. When those we have elected to protect, Serve and defend us, Forsake us for their own selfish motives, In the name of Politics, We are indeed Nations in Peril.

We have waited three long years for the conclusion, which when received was totally Ludicrous. To further discover; the limited extent of the investigation, the great internal strife that existed within the Canadian Aviation Safety Board, the vast amount of information withheld by the investigators and the United States Government agencies, and the fighting between Political parties over this situation, caused extreme concern, that this was indeed a cover-up and that the Gander issue was now a Political "Football." We are speaking of "The worst Aviation disaster in Canadian history" and "The greatest loss of Military men in Peace time"—"The second longest day."

The Canadian Aviation Safety Board was split 5 to 4 over the cause of the crash. The 5 majority board members stated, "The most probable cause of the crash was ice contamination on the leading edge and upper surface of the wings." There are at least 20 witnesses, that worked on or near the plane, that are willing to testify that there was no ice on the wings of the aircraft.

Further, there is no evidence to prove that there was ice on the wings. But there is proof that there was no ice on the wings. The U.S. Airline Pilots Association report that came out June 23, 1989, proved the Canadians relied on fabricated and erroneous information. And that there was no ice on the wings. And the flight recorder had been tampered with.

The 4 minority members of the Canadian Aviation Safety Board, plus another member, who resigned over the dissension stated, "An in-flight fire, that may have resulted from Detonations of undetermined origin brought about catastrophic system failures." The possibility of Sabotage was never investigated by the R.C.M.P. or the investigators! Many claims of responsibility by Terrorist groups were never investigated. Two hours after these claims were made Both Governments dismissed them. How could they know without a complete investigation? Mr. Irving Pinkel, a well known Explosion Expert, stated that the crash was indeed caused by an explosion! Dr. R.T. Sheperd, of London, England, an expert in Forensic Pathology, Disagreed with the autopsy reports done by the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology at Dover. He questioned their results, which claimed, that some of the victims could have survived as

long as 5 minutes, even though they had multiple and extremely severe amputations. This conclusion reached by Dover, then supported the majority conclusion of "Probable Invisible Ice." Dr. R.T. Sheperd's reports have never been made part of the evidence and Investigation! People who worked at the crash site have reported illnesses of Questionable nature. The Cargo Manifest has never been released! What was on the plane? Why all the Secrecy and Hiding of Evidence?

It is interesting to note, that the 4 minority members of the Canadian Aviation Safety Board, and the resigned member possess more impressive credentials than the majority. They are as follows;

1. Mr. Mussalem: Aeronautical Engineer and Pilot
2. Mr. La Croix: Brigadier General of the Canadian Air Force. With 7,000 flight hours. He is a resigned member.
3. Mr. Stevenson: Airline Pilot and Military pilot in WWII.
4. Dr. Filotas: Aeronautical Engineer-Ph.D.
5. Mr. L. Bobitt: Aeronautical Engineer-Masters Degree.

Valuable and critical information was withheld from these board members who were named above. It was as if it was decided early in the investigation what the cause would be, anything that did not fit that scenario was eliminated or withheld. Witnesses who spoke to investigators and whose testimony did not fit their preconceived cause of the crash were discredited or treated as though it did not matter and was of no importance. There was every opportunity in the world for Sabotage! The plane was at Cairo and Cologne for an extended period of time, was virtually Unguarded and was loaded and attended by Non-Military Personnel.

This is a matter of Record! The baggage was loaded by Egyptian Contracted Personnel. It was not thoroughly checked. Wooden boxes were loaded and to this day, No one will state what was in them. In Germany Contracted German Personnel serviced the plane. In both places the cargo doors were opened! None of these people who worked on the plane at either location, were ever questioned! Why not? The explosion occurred in the forward baggage compartment!

The transport Minister, Benoit Bouchard, has repeatedly denied a request for a "Judicial Inquiry". At one time he stated that it would be "Irresponsible". He has instead called for a review by a "Retired" Supreme Court Judge, Mr. Justice Estey. The scope of this review is extremely and dangerously limited! No new evidence can be submitted, no testimony can be heard by anyone, and a review like this has never been held before! Minister Bouchard called for this review due to pressure that was being placed on him by the Liberal Party and the press. His other motives for this were to stall for time until the Parliament and House of Commons were in Recess. To Prematurely disband the Canadian Aviation Safety Board and establish a new Multimoda board. This would then rid him of the Minority members of the board, who opposed the majority decision for the Gander crash. All this before Mr. Justice Estey makes his recommendations, concerning the Gander incident and it is known which faction is correct. It is interesting to note that Minister Bouchard's own department found that the investigation was mismanaged and he knew nothing about it! At that time his resigna-

tion was called for. The United States Government has steadfastly refused to help us in this matter. The State Department has stated that they have no further information and that this is an Internal matter, in Canada. Therefore, they can not be involved. There is a multitude of agencies in this country that have conducted investigations into this tragedy. Included are the N.T.S.B., The C.I.D., The State Department, The Pentagon, The Department of Transportation, The Justice Department, The Military Airlift Command, and the Department of the Army.

They will not release any of their findings to the Canadian Aviation Safety Board! How then can there be a thorough Investigation? The N.T.S.B. states that the Canadian Investigation was thorough. They agree with the majority findings of "Probable, Invisible Ice." They question nothing! The week of May 8, 1989, Mr. and Mrs. Douglas Phillips whose son was on the plane, and organized the group of Families for Truth about Gander went to Ottawa, Canada, and met with the Liberal Caucus, the minority members of the Canadian Aviation Safety board, press, and media. They made known our plea for a Judicial Inquiry into the Gander Crash. The public there support us, as do all of those above. We are certainly not alone in our fears of a Cover-Up! We are afraid that this is a Cover-Up of Gigantic Proportions! Is it possible this could be tied into the Iran-Contra situation? The Plans of Oliver North and his associates began to fall apart days before the crash. We think there is more than a possibility that this situation put our loved ones in "Harms' Way!"

We now have information that Arrow Air was flying arms to the Contras. If 256 lives were lost because of Covert, Illegal, and Illicit activity perpetrated by members of our Government—We have to know! These men and women were not Expendable items! They trusted their government to protect them as much as they protected this country, not to put them into a position where they could be targets in Peace time! If this is the case this is indeed Criminal Action! There is so much more that we could discuss. This is a most complicated situation. We have accumulated boxes and boxes of documents and data. If you wish additional information we will be happy to send it. If you wish others to contact in this matter we will be pleased to give you their names and how they can be contacted. Time is running out for Us. With Media attention, Limited as it has been in this country, we need a Miracle!

We are in desperate need of your help. We know how busy you must be, but hope that you can assist Us. A tragic Injustice has been done and you are our last hope. We hope that you will give this matter your immediate attention. We look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

DANA L. EDMONDS (sister)  
CONSTANCE FARMER  
(mother)

□ 1820

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMISSION ON POLICIES AND PROGRAMS AFFECTING ALASKA NATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today along with my Senate colleagues, Senators STEVENS and MURKOWSKI to establish a joint Federal-State Commission on Policies and Programs Affecting Alaska Natives.

The purpose of this Commission is to investigate and review policies founded in law and existing Federal and State programs significantly affecting the health and well-being of Alaska Natives. The Commission is to be made up of 14 individuals appointed equally by the President of the United States and the Governor of Alaska and is to conduct a comprehensive study of the social and economic status of Alaska Natives. The Commission is also to recommend specific actions to the Congress and to the State of Alaska to see that Alaska Natives have life opportunities comparable to other Americans, while respecting their unique traditions, cultures, and status as Alaska Natives. The recommendations could become the basis of remedial legislation.

It is my hope that this Commission, once established, will seek creative ideas to relieve some of the most difficult situations facing Alaska Natives, especially young people in rural areas. Maintaining programs as usual is not the answer. We need to consider a transfer among existing programs and/or new programs to reflect the priorities and challenges of the 1990's.

Young people in rural Alaska are facing severe problems of high levels of suicide, alcoholism and educational problems. Self-esteem, the most precious part of childhood, has suffered. The keys to rebuilding the opportunities for youth revolve around family, jobs and health. Federal and State programs can assist here and need to be retooled to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this concept of a Joint Commission is timely and necessary. In the coming months, I will work with the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. UDALL, and other members to achieve passage of this important legislation.

#### THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday this week when the House considered H.R. 2883, the rural development, agriculture and related agencies appropriations bill, I was unable to participate in the general debate over this measure because of a previously scheduled hearing in the Panama Canal/Outer Continental Shelf Subcommittee, a subcommittee which I chair.

I would like to rise today to reiterate my strong support for H.R. 2883, which funds our Federal farm and rural development programs. I want to take this opportunity to thank the Chairman, Mr. WHITTEN, and the members of the Appropriations Committee for their hard

work in putting together this important legislation.

As the Representative of Maryland's rural First District, I realize the need for a strong agricultural sector. The 7,000 farmers in my 13 county district represent over half the farmers in the State of Maryland. They produce 90 percent of the State's soybean and tobacco crops, and account for the entire broiler industry, which is the sixth largest in the country. A decline in the farm economy means farm foreclosures, fewer local jobs, a smaller tax base, along with an increase in government subsidy.

Since 1933, the Federal Government, farmers, and rural families have worked closely together to strengthen the farm economy and improve rural services. Over the years, this cooperative effort has led Congress to approve legislation to provide electricity, telephone service, clean water, and housing, as well as many other services to rural families. This has meant an improved quality of life for many Eastern Shore, southern Maryland and northeast Maryland families and communities. H.R. 2883 allows us to build upon this successful partnership.

H.R. 2883 strengthens the Farmers Home Administration Water and Sewer Facility and Community Facility Loan Programs. Over the past 5 years, the FmHA has provided \$25 million in loan and grants to Maryland's First District to construct waste/water treatment plants, purchase fire equipment, renovate hospitals, construct libraries, as well as many other important projects. Without this assistance, it's very likely these projects would not have taken place.

H.R. 2883 continues to place emphasis on critically needed agricultural research. To remain competitive in the world market, Maryland farmers must be able to increase production at reduced costs. The way to reach this goal is with additional crop and animal research. This legislation will provide the University of Maryland Eastern Shore, one of the Nation's leading agricultural research universities, \$834,000 to fund new research projects.

This legislation also provides special recognition to the need for additional poultry research. Delmarva broiler farmers will be pleased to learn that funding for mycoplasma, a poultry respiratory disease, has been nearly doubled to \$233,000. In addition, \$2.5 million has been approved to expand the Southeast Poultry Research Laboratory in Athens, GA, to study avian influenza and exotic Newcastle disease. This research is critical to Maryland's \$1 billion broiler industry.

Maryland farmers and watermen will be pleased by the fact that the Chesapeake Bay has been singled out for two projects. First, H.R. 2883 will provide \$2.1 million to the Soil Conservation Service to assist Maryland farmers in the cleanup of the Bay. Secondly, the bill contains a \$375,000 grant for Chesapeake Bay aquaculture research. As the largest estuary in the United States, and home to 200 fish varieties and 2,700 plant and animal species, the Bay is an ideal location for this project.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to commend Chairman WHITTEN and the distinguished members of his subcommittee for their thoughtful work.

#### USING TAXPAYERS' MONEY FOR DEFENSE ADS IS AGAINST LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled. Every morning I open the newspaper and see full-page ad after full-page ad, trumpeting the B-2 bomber, the V-22 Osprey, or some other incredibly expensive, and highly questionable, weapon programs. Glossy pictures, bar graphs, pie charts, simple-minded briefing books and other propaganda extolling these weapons rain down upon congressional offices, insulting our intelligence and wasting time and money. One defense contractor, Northrop Corp., even plans to have 30 television commercials on "Good Morning, America" in hopes of saving its besieged B-2 Bomber Program.

Care to guess who's paying for this outrageously misdirected and expensive ad campaign? I'll wager it's the American taxpayer—and that's against the law.

The fiscal year 1986 defense authorization bill banned defense contractors' advertising costs and the costs of other forms of lobbying from reimbursement by the Government.

Now, it appears that the contractors want to test the law. With their most expensive, and most profitable, weapon programs on the chopping block, the contractors are getting desperate.

I demand that the Department of Defense conduct a thorough cost accounting for this advertising blitz. I want Rockwell, Boeing, Northrup, and McDonnell Douglas, among others, to prove that this Public Relations campaign is not being funded by the public.

It is unacceptable and illegal for the taxpayers to foot the bill for this misguided campaign to line the pockets of defense contractors.

#### THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in calling for a just resolution of the conflict in Cyprus on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the invasion of this country by the Turkish Army.

On July 20, 1974, the Armed Forces of Turkey swept into the Republic of Cyprus, and occupied nearly 40 percent of the northern part of this small island. Extensive evidence exists, detailing the barbaric atrocities committed by the Turks during and after the invasion, including the destruction of ancient Orthodox churches.

Today, 15 years later, there are still 1,614 missing Greek Cypriots and over 180,000 people who are prevented from returning to their homes now occupied by the Turks. This year, in March, the Women Walk Home organization crossed the illegal "Green line," which separates northern and southern Cyprus, in order to help focus world attention

on this situation, and to hold Turkey accountable for its illegal actions.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of this tragic event, I join with all freedom-loving people throughout the world in putting pressure on Turkey to reach a peaceful resolution of this ongoing conflict. It is our hope that the Republic of Cyprus will one day be reunified and returned to its former status, as a free and independent country, without foreign domination or occupation. To achieve this just objective, we demand the immediate withdrawal of Turkish forces from Cyprus, as well as retributions for the numerous crimes committed against Greek Cypriots.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, to discuss a critical problem and along with my esteemed colleague, Mr. MILLER, to introduce a package of bills designed to address the complex problem: domestic violence. The statistics concerning this issue are startling. Every 15 seconds, a woman is beaten in her home. An estimated 3 to 4 million American women are battered each year by their husbands or partners, and every day at least four women are killed by their batterers. Continued domestic violence, particularly against women and children, can no longer be excused or ignored. This package of bills will begin to address the concerns of child custody and the judicial system's response to domestic violence, and the critical need for housing.

Contrary to what many people believe, domestic violence knows no cultural or social boundaries. The victims are rich and poor, young and old, and live in urban and rural settings. Low-income battered women are more likely to seek assistance from public agencies, such as shelters and hospital emergency rooms, because they have fewer private resources than middle and upper income women. More affluent women are reluctant to talk of their battering due to the social stigma of keeping family matters private. I believe the elimination of domestic violence must be viewed as a national priority.

Domestic violence, or battering, is a mechanism for establishing control over another person through fear and

intimidation. A sense of hopelessness and helplessness becomes the victim's reality. Not all battering is physical. It includes emotional, economic, and sexual abuse, threats against children, intimidation and isolation.

Battering escalates over time, and significantly increases when the woman is pregnant. Domestic violence is rarely a single isolated event. Data from the national crime survey demonstrates that once a woman is victimized by domestic violence, she faces a high risk of being victimized again. A police foundation study in Detroit and Kansas City found that in 85 percent to 90 percent of partner homicides, police had been called to the home at least once during the 2 years preceding the incident; in more than half of these cases, they had been called five times or more.

In my own State of Maryland, 19 women were killed by their partners in 1988. Within Montgomery County, MD, alone, the abused persons hotline receives at least 25,000 calls per year, and this number is steadily rising.

The abuse begins with name calling, but may escalate to a life-threatening situation. Domestic violence is the No. 1 cause of injury to women, and has been cited by the Surgeon General as a major health problem. More than 1 million abused women seek medical help for injuries caused by battering each year.

Why does battering occur? There are many theories explaining this behavior: economic disparity, socialization, rights given by marriage, the media and its focus on violence, sexism, lack of negative enforcement for battering, family conflict and differing gender norms. The truth is that batterers choose to abuse their partners because the choice is there to make, and there has been no consequence for these actions.

Domestic violence and child custody litigation are interrelated problems which must be recognized by the State courts. There must be a cooperative effort by law enforcement agencies, legislatures, and the courts in order to adequately address this problem and provide a deterrent. I am introducing a concurrent resolution which addresses the issue of domestic violence and child custody. This resolution encourages the State courts, when making child custody determinations, to consider evidence of spousal abuse as detrimental to the child to be placed in the custody of the abusive parent.

A current trend in the State courts is encouraging joint custody and mediation when determining child custody cases. Unfortunately, mediation assumes that two equal parties can negotiate in good faith with each other and solve problems. However, in the case of domestic violence, battering is a tool used to maintain control over another person, thus creating an unequal

power base. This unequal relationship creates an atmosphere for concessions in order to prevent further contact with the abuser. Therefore, in some cases, joint custody and mediation may not be the most appropriate method for determining child custody. Due to the continued contact required by mediation and joint custody, the victim and the child are at increased risk for abuse.

Children are victims too. Not only is child abuse more likely in homes where the wife is battered, but children are also often witnesses to the battering. The effect of spouse abuse on children includes emotional and physical harm. The witnessing of this abuse can result in immediate reactions of shock, fear, and guilt, with potential long-lasting effects, including lowered self-esteem, developmental problems and impaired socialization.

Studies show violent tendencies may be passed on from one generation to the next. Children in violent families learn to use physical violence as an outlet for anger and a means for resolving conflict. Battering is socially learned behavior. Witnessing domestic violence, as a child, has been identified as the most common risk factor for becoming a batterer in adulthood. This is a cycle which can and must be broken. But, this cycle can only be broken when there is a recognized consequence for these actions.

In order to begin to address this very critical issue, the judicial system needs to recognize the specific concerns and problems associated with domestic violence, particularly as they relate to child custody. Judicial training on the dynamics of domestic violence is essential to guide the courts in their determinations.

The State Justice Institute, created in 1984, awards grants and contracts to State and local courts, and nonprofit organizations for the purpose of improving the administration of justice in State courts. This bill calls for the State Justice Institute to award up to five grants to investigate State judicial decisions relating to child custody litigation involving domestic violence and to develop a training program for State judges to enhance their understanding of domestic violence and child custody. I applaud the current trend toward arrest and prosecution of offenders; through education, our courts can better respond to the needs of the people whom they serve.

Battered women are often not viewed as having a housing problem but this is, in fact, one of the most basic issues a battered woman faces when attempting to escape an abusive relationship. In 1986, domestic violence shelters provided emergency housing to 311,000 battered women and their children nationwide, and twice that number were turned away

because of the critical shortage of shelter space. Battered women are still faced with homelessness even when they are in shelters because of time limits requiring that they leave in 2 weeks, 1 month, or at most, 3 months.

The Family Housing Options Program Act of 1989 begins to meet the critical housing needs of residents in domestic violence shelters, and emergency and transitional housing programs. This bill would reserve 5 percent of the annual allotment of section 8 certificates and vouchers for homeless families and displaced families affected by domestic violence. This assistance would be administered through the local public housing agency, based on referrals from domestic violence shelters, and emergency and transitional housing programs.

Another provision of the bill would allow families to pool their assistance in shared housing arrangements in order to effectively and efficiently meet their housing needs. Shared housing is a creative solution to a critical housing problem. This arrangement provides flexibility, is cost effective and provides a network of support.

Mr. Speaker, domestic violence affects all of us. American businesses lose \$3 to \$5 billion each year because of abuse-related absenteeism and another \$100 million in medical bills. Our local communities spend millions of dollars on domestic violence intervention each year, including law enforcement, court proceedings, health care, and social services. It is time to stop this abuse within our homes.

I have worked extensively with the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence in drafting this legislation. This coalition represents a network of over 1,200 shelters, safe homes, and counseling programs for battered women and their families. I applaud their dedication toward providing an environment free of violence, and their efforts toward educating us on this issue.

I appreciate the efforts and leadership of Mr. MILLER, chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Family. His expertise and commitment is important to the passage of these bills. I look forward to working with him in the coming months.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

The resolution states that:

State courts have failed to recognize the detrimental effects of domestic violence (DV) by their failure to hear evidence of DV when determining child custody cases.

Joint custody and mandatory mediation are inappropriate in child custody cases where there is evidence of DV.

Joint custody guarantees continued access and control over the victim by the batterer.

DV against the victim often increases during and after a divorce; therefore, the victim and child are increasingly at risk in shared custody arrangements and unsupervised visitation.

Spouse abuse is relevant to child abuse.

The effects of spouse abuse on children include actual and potential emotional and physical harm. An abusive spouse provides an inappropriate role model, and potential for future harm to the children.

Children are emotionally traumatized by witnessing abuse of a parent.

Children are often victims of physical abuse when they attempt to intervene on behalf of a parent.

Children are affected by the climate of violence in their home.

DV research shows that violent tendencies may be passed on from one generation to the next.

Witnessing an aggressive parent as a role model communicates to children that violence is an acceptable tool for resolving marital conflict.

Few states have enacted legislation that allows or requires courts to consider evidence of spouse abuse in child custody cases. (There are five states who have passed such legislation.)

Resolution: For purposes of child custody, evidence of spousal abuse should create a statutory presumption that it is determined to the child to be placed in the custody of the abusive parent.

#### STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

The State Justice Institute (SJI) was created by the State Justice Institute Act of 1984. The Institute is authorized to award grants, cooperative agreements and contracts to state and local courts, and nonprofit organizations for the purpose of improving the administration of justice in the state courts. The SJI has been authorized for Fiscal Year 1989 at \$10.98 million. The SJI is totally separate from the Department of Justice.

The purpose of this bill is to carry out research, and develop a judicial training curricula relating to child custody and domestic violence (DV).

Included within this bill is our definition of DV:

Any action which attempts to cause or intentionally knowingly, or recklessly cause bodily injury or physical illness.

Rape, sexual assault, or any action causing involuntary deviate sexual intercourse.

Physical menace resulting in the fear of imminent serious bodily injury.

False imprisonment by a spouse, former spouse, sexual partner, or those who share biological parenthood of, have adopted, legal custodians of, or are stepparents of a minor child.

Physical or sexual abuse of such minor by either spouse, former spouse, or partner.

The SJI will conduct up to 5 projects to: Investigate state judicial decisions relating to child custody litigation involving domestic violence. Develop a training curricula for state judges to develop an understanding of child custody litigation and DV. Disseminate the results of the investigation and curricula to state courts.

The bill authorizes \$600,000 for purposes of carrying out this legislation.

Also, included within this bill, are some technical amendments requested by the SJI. The purpose of this language is to clear up previous authorization languages.

#### FAMILY HOUSING OPTIONS PROGRAM ACT OF 1989

This bill amends Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

For each Fiscal Year at least 5% of all Section 8 vouchers and certificates would be

provided to those in domestic violence shelters, and emergency and transitional housing programs.

This assistance would be administered through the local public housing agencies.

Public housing agencies would consult with state, local, and private agencies and organizations for referrals of families to receive assistance.

Families would be allowed to use the assistance provided in shared housing arrangements in order to effectively and efficiently meet their housing needs and reduce their costs of housing.

The contributions made by one family on behalf of a shared housing arrangement could not be considered when determining income, for the other families within the shared housing arrangement, for eligibility for other federal assistance.

State allocations of this assistance will be determined by the number of domestic violence shelters, and emergency and transitional housing programs in each State and the number of families served by the shelters and programs.

For each Fiscal year, a report by each state will be submitted to the Secretary of HUD, to include: A list of DV shelters, and emergency and transitional housing programs in the state which received assistance. A description of the method for selection of families assisted. Analysis of pros and cons regarding the assistance.

The Secretary of HUD will include a summary of these reports in the annual report already required under Section 8.

This amendment will go into effect the first Fiscal Year after enactment.

□ 1830

#### PRESIDENT BUSH IN POLAND AND HUNGARY: A SIGN OF AMERICA'S NEW ROLE IN WORLD AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARPENTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has just concluded his visit to Poland, Hungary, and the economic summit in Paris, proclaiming the trip an overwhelming success. I agree that the trip was certainly of great importance, and in the context of the times, it was a success.

Along with millions of Polish Americans, I experienced great pride seeing the leader of the free world in the homeland of the long-struggling Polish people, who are now on the threshold of democracy and freedom. But, as demonstrated at the concluding Paris summit, the mission highlighted a bigger picture—the new role of the United States in world affairs.

#### THE BIG PICTURE

Virtually everyone agrees that the liberalization underway in Poland and Hungary is monumental, signaling unprecedented potential for democracy and capitalism in Eastern Europe. Likewise, almost everyone agrees that Poland provides the perfect platform for American leadership, the promo-

tion of the American vision of a free, democratic Eastern Europe. For 40 years Poland has been at the top of the United States' foreign policy agenda. Poland was the crucible of the cold war and center stage for the long-running policy of containment. As Poland approached the threshold of democracy and restructuring with the conclusion of the Roundtable negotiations in April, I began calling for an active, constructive role for the President in supporting the positive reforms. In the months since, the President has provided the minimum support each step of the way, concluding with his symbolic and undramatic trip to Poland and Hungary. It seems there is a revolution underway in Eastern Europe, and the United States has not responded in kind.

Americans seem to agree on one thing regarding America's limited reaction to events in Poland. Everyone seems to concede that the inadequate U.S. response is necessary:

"It is no longer 1948, it's simply impossible for the United States to bail out countries in the name of democracy."

"The days of the Marshall Plan are over."

Budget pressures and the national debt have made the typical American approach of granting a lucrative foreign aid package outdated and politically unfeasible. Thus, the United States leadership role has become one of symbolism, rhetoric, and incomplete aid packages, and no one seems to dispute this reality.

But one thing people have failed to discuss are the roots of this new limited American role in world affairs. The United States no longer has the economic resources necessary to lead the promotion of democracy and free enterprise in Eastern Europe. This shortcoming directly results from the economic and trade policy of the past 10 years. Had Poland's renewal come 10 years ago, I am convinced the American reaction would have been far different and much less feeble. In 1979, American oratory could have combined with sufficient economic assistance to ease restructuring and hasten the arrival of democracy. In 1989, such assistance is impossible. In Bush's undramatic response to dramatic opportunities in Eastern Europe, I see the manifestation of 10 years of faulty economic and trade policy, which comes in a surprising arena—foreign affairs.

This reality is ironic, for I believe the military policy of the Reagan era reestablished American influence in world affairs. But because of Gorbachev's turn toward peace, foreign affairs has quickly changed from a military battlefield to one where economic competitiveness is vital. Consequently, the Reagan economic policy has actu-

ally undermined America's rejuvenated position as a leader in world affairs.

For Democrats, this reality is important. In America's limited leadership capabilities, we see a clear negative result of Republican economic and trade policy, something Democrats have long sought. For while economists and writers have long predicted the eventual catastrophe which will be the result of Reaganomics, the lack of concrete signs has prevented Democrats from convincing the voters. I believe we are seeing a concrete sign in the undermining of American foreign policy. Democrats should make this "big picture" a focus of our reaction to Bush's handling of the miracle underway in Poland and Eastern Europe.

#### A NEW APPROACH WITH THE FOCUS ON LEADERSHIP

Accepting our limited economic resources and the consequent restrictions on American foreign policy, the United States is forced to find ways to maintain our leadership. American leadership of the free world against the Soviet Union, in containing and rolling back communism, has allowed the miracle underway in Poland. Poland is preparing to reap the rewards of America's policy of the last 40 years, and the United States should not sacrifice its leadership role. Leadership of creativity and conviction can fill the gap left by the United States' limited bankroll. Herein lies the President's greatest shortcoming. With financial restrictions dictating American aid potential, the President has failed to make up the difference with spirited leadership of vision.

I believe there is one clear direction to take toward Poland and Hungary—a new multilateral approach, an organized consortium for aid and lending comprised of the wealthiest democracies. Since April, the administration has made it clear that the United States would need cooperation from the West in aiding Poland. However, this indication has been in the form of introducing an inadequate plan and then announcing as an afterthought, "But we need your help" to Western Europe and Japan. This approach will not be successful. What is needed to support Poland is not a declaration of concern by a loose-knit group of sympathetic Western nations, but a binding agreement to multilaterally invest in Eastern Europe. At the Paris summit I fully expected the President to propose a formal consortium of the wealthiest nations, to promote democracy and free markets in Eastern Europe.

Instead, I am troubled by the outcome of the Paris summit on the subject of Eastern Europe. In the summit communique, the seven nations vaguely agreed that "in Poland and Hungary, pluralism and capitalism need the concerted economic support of the Western nations." We can hope that

the followup talks run by the Executive Commission of the European Community will result in an effective consortium, but without strong leadership, I doubt that Japan and West Germany will follow a multilateral directive. Herein lies the second problem—the President has willingly sacrificed Western leadership in Eastern Europe to the European Community. The United States should not feel comfortable simply handing over the leadership of free democracies after 50 years.

In order for a multilateral approach to promoting democracy and free markets in Eastern Europe to be successful, strong leadership is necessary. I believe the United States is the only qualified leader.

The United States has accumulated a great deal of leverage in leading the free world since World War II. In light of our depleted financial reserves, this leverage can play a large role in maintaining strong American leadership. For 40 years, the United States has guaranteed democracy and free markets for the Western nations against the very real (until recently) threat of Soviet expansion. Costly military protection of Western Europe and Japan has allowed those nations to concentrate on economic competitiveness rather than defense.

A perfect example of the advantages afforded our allies by U.S. military protection can be seen in expenditures for research and development. While Japan has the luxury of investing in the development of new products to dominate the American and world markets, American Research and Development is dominated by defense objectives. While 69 percent (\$69 billion) of United States R&D funds went to defense in 1987, the Japanese spent 4.5 percent (\$1.7 billion) and West Germany spent 12.5 percent (\$2.4 billion) on defense. Japan, West Germany, France, Great Britain, and all industrialized nations gear R&D expenditures towards economic competitiveness more than the United States. 15.3 percent (\$2.9 billion) of West German funds go to industrial development, as does 4.8 percent (\$1.9 billion) of Japanese expenditures. The United States Government spends only \$200 million yearly.

I believe it is our right to say to our allies: "we would like to continue to guarantee democracy and free enterprise like we did yours, but the United States does not have the resources to do it alone". United States protection afforded West Germany and Japan economic prosperity. We must demand their cooperation in promoting Eastern European democracy. Furthermore, the EC and Japan will gain at least as much as the United States from new market-economy trading partners in Eastern Europe.

Because other Western nations will gain similarly from a free Eastern Europe, and because our military protection has both afforded their prosperity and undermined our foreign policy, and because the United States should do all it can to bring democracy and freedom to Poland and Hungary, President Bush should feel comfortable creating a formal consortium of wealthy nations to invest in democracy. Instead, the Paris summit agreed on "concerted," but not coordinated support of Poland. I doubt such an approach will provide the investment and aid Poland requires to restructure and ease the "frustration index" for the Polish people.

An organized consortium should focus on investment in native private industry, or even public industry, with the condition that comanagement or management training, as well as technology modernization, be part of the deal. This prevents foreign investment from becoming subsidies to maintain outdated industries in the interest of short-term jobs. Joint ventures, or infusing technology and management skills along with investment, is favorable to direct ventures. Joint ventures allow Poland to accumulate more hard currency, which is one key to stabilizing inflation and relieving Poland's debt.

Remarkably, there will be no roadblocks to capitalist investment on behalf of the Soviet bloc nations: Every country but the GDR now permits joint ventures with Western companies. New features in several countries' laws are designed to ease registration requirements, offer tax incentives, and increase Western share of ownership beyond 50 percent. Without a unified approach, Western support of Poland and all Eastern Europe's revitalization will not reach its potential.

The consortium should not be a one-time project for Poland and Hungary. Rather, the United States should promote an organization of the wealthy democratic nations committed to investing in nations where democracy is clearly developing. A unified framework for Poland and Hungary should be used as each new Eastern European country begins its liberalization (many estimate that reform in Czechoslovakia is only a year or two away).

Perhaps the NATO military alliance is becoming less important as the Warsaw pact loosens. But as the field of competition changes to economics, why not form a similar economic alliance committed to creating free market democracies worldwide? Clearly, the time for such monumental restructuring of world affairs is upon us, but only Gorbachev seems to have the ideas. Thus, we see an opportunity lost for United States leadership.

Admittedly, organizing a true economic alliance with the goal of democracy and freedom is an ambitious un-

dertaking. It is also an appropriate and necessary response to the revolution underway in Eastern Europe from the leader of the free world. It is an approach dictated by limited economic reserves. It requires strong conviction and dynamic leadership from the United States, using our leverage, in order to be successful.

For that reason, it is unlikely that President Bush will take any such creative approach. I can see Franklin Roosevelt, John Kennedy, or Ronald Reagan proposing a dramatic new order, calling for a new economic alliance for democracy, but George Bush will continue to avoid such boldness, with two unfortunate results: America's leadership of the democracies will continue to fade, and Poland and other nations will not receive the greatest potential support of their fight for democracy and freedom.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Bush's recent trip to Poland highlighted the role which America must play in a world which is increasingly turning toward democracy. Our President was hailed as the living symbol of the world's greatest free nation, and great things were expected of him. While I applaud the steps which the President took, in supplying some small financial aid and encouraging business development, I have to join my colleagues and the people of Poland in delivering a simple message. "It's not enough. We can, and must, do better than that."

Under perestroika, the Soviet Union is beginning to permit some small strains of democracy in the Eastern bloc. We have seen movement toward freer elections, a diminution of the broad policymaking dictates of the KGB. Even more striking, Eastern bloc countries have opened their societies for the first time to western ideas and democratic influences. These steps have made Poland eager to take the first few steps toward democracy and individual freedom. We must teach these Eastern European nations struggling towards fairer elections how freedom makes nations flourish. We must become their partners in democracy with major investments of political and financial capital.

If we do not, an historic opportunity will be lost. Communism has failed these nations, and while we might not call their present systems democratic, if the people of Poland do not see these startling new changes begin to produce jobs and a better standard of living, we will lose our opportunity.

Poland has turned to a more democratic system because government has lost the confidence of its people. During the parliamentary elections, some government representatives who were running unopposed, were not elected because they did not receive half of the votes cast in their district. The old, Soviet-tied government has been discredited, giving the West an opportunity to make democracy work in three specific ways: food aid, debt forgiveness, and industry incentives to locate in Poland.

Poland desperately needs our help. If government subsidies for food were lifted today, 80 percent of the Polish population would be living below the poverty line. President Bush

did not focus on food aid during his trip, but if the Western nations put some of their yearly food surplus at Poland's disposal, three important processes would begin. First, Poland could reduce food price support payments without allowing prices to skyrocket beyond the means of its citizens. Just as important, the capital which had been dedicated to keeping down prices could be invested in the infrastructure and economy of Poland, helping to spur the nation's financial growth. All of this could come from taking food out of storage and onto airplanes headed for Poland.

Two further vital initiatives also would aid Poland's ailing economy. The Western nations, and particularly the United States, must examine their debt policy, and carefully consider forgiving some part of that debt. If Poland sinks back into failed socialism, what good will those imaginary dollars do us, compared to the benefits of a democratic Poland?

Finally, when Lech Walesa was asked to define Poland's most pressing need, he simply said "employers." The all powerful, all-employing state can't be dismantled until there are private employers to replace it. We can help by offering tax incentives to businesses to locate part of their business in Poland, but there are two important rules we must insist upon. Under Gorbachev's perestroika, foreign investors are only allowed to become minority partners owning up to 49 percent of a business. Even more restrictive is the prohibition against taking any proceeds out of the country. Those conditions are unacceptable, and our State Department should make changing them a priority.

U.S. businesses will be more likely to invest in ventures where they retain control for two reasons. First they will have more confidence that they can make a profit. And more importantly, their experience in a competitive market will make the ventures more successful, and more useful as models to the Poles whose businesses will be entering a brave new market.

President Bush understandably wants to limit our financial obligations to Poland in a time of budgetary and fiscal problems in this country. But food aid, debt forgiveness, and business tax incentives are three ways to show Poland that 30 years of promising that we would help them if we could are going to be honored now that we finally are in a position to do so.

Our actions can have the effect of creating more momentum among our allies for progress. As Secretary Baker said, our Western allies have followed the U.S. lead in Eastern Europe. Taking further steps like those I have outlined puts us more boldly in the lead, and challenge our allies to do more as well. Our three-part aid program should also encourage nations like Japan and West Germany to help Poland with the hard currency relief we are unable to supply.

Poland and Hungary have turned to democracy for relief from the hunger and dim future of their present system. The great democracies must embrace them, or risk losing this historic chance to transform Eastern Europe and the world.

□ 1850

## TELEVISION AND AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy without prior notification of a special order. I thought that my staff had asked for 60 minutes this evening. Come to think of it, it is my fault, because I did not ask the staff to ask for the 60 minutes. I forgot.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked for this time is to elucidate a controversy that is going on in the media at this moment, that takes place tonight, on what is called one of the superstations of America. This is not necessarily meaning the quality of the programming, but the fact that one of our VHF channels has the right to sell on cable television, free enterprise right, and therefore is available on cable all the way across the country. We have one station in New York like this, WWOR, one in Chicago, WGN, and one in Atlanta, WTBS. Those call letters were changed when an American entrepreneur named Ted Turner bought the station, and changed the letters to Turner Broadcasting System, with the east coast "W" in front of it, so WTBS is the superstation out of Atlanta. I got it on cable for the last 4 years here. I have moved in Virginia to an area that does not have cable, in Fairfax Station, but in my home in Garden Grove, CA, I occasionally watch the channel, and it is pretty good programming. It is owned by Mr. Ted Turner, and its available, potential audience is 49,500 people. Mr. Turner changed the landscape, Mr. Ted Turner, of the United States of America, and how its citizens get its information. When he challenged the lock of the three networks on American broadcasting and established Cable Network News, 24 hours around the clock service, it was so successful that he established Headline News, CNN-2, and those two stations together have an audience of 50.5 million. Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that our C-SPAN services that are available to the whole country, which has really blown out the walls of this gallery, as I have said umpteen times, and enabled Americans to follow the course of our proceedings in this body and the other deliberative body, the U.S. Senate, that that C-SPAN service is a magnificent service to include millions of Americans in the process of their government. However, from the best estimates, and there have been no careful scientific surveys, the audience available to this Chamber is about half a million people.

Now, because of a little disagreement between the minority in this House, the Republicans, and two

Speakers ago, the decision was made to take our House of Representatives' cameras and show the auditorium here occasionally, our Chamber, that it is empty. In this case, there is only one Member on the floor, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH], doing work on something else, and myself, and the distinguished staff here. However, keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that 500,000 people, that is five Rose Bowls, five coliseums, five superdomes, filled with people are watching the proceedings of this Chamber, but a half a million people is a far cry from Ted Turner's 50 million plus watching CNN and CNN-2. I bet it was a bigger audience than that when we saw the live coverage of the tragic airline crash in Sioux City, IA, yesterday. Then, with TBS, the superstation out of Atlanta, has almost 50 million, in its own right, and then, as if Mr. Turner does not have the Midas touch, he starts another television cable channel called TNT, Turner Network Television, which is a clever acronym, TNT, and on that, he is showing all of the library of over 3,000 films from MGM. He created an artistic controversy in this country, and I think he is more right than wrong on this, called colorization.

□ 1900

The other night, before we moved and lost our cable television, we turned on TNT and watched "Jekyll and Hyde," an excellent Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer film, about 1941 vintage, that won an academy award for Spencer Tracy, and I am looking at a very young Lana Turner, a very young Ingrid Bergman, and one of the greatest actors of our time, Spencer Tracy, in color in this classic film, and I think it was excellent. I agree with my friend and great actor, Jimmy Stewart, that we cannot colorize classics like "Citizen Kane," but certainly taking "Mutiny on the Bounty," made in 1935, with a very young and very excellent Clark Gable nominated for an Academy Award for that, and colorizing it, which MGM would have done if they had the budget, that is an argument that Ted Turner is going to win.

What is happening with TNT? It is another goldmine. The man has the Midas touch. He is cleaning up with this library of MGM films and about 1,600 hours of old television films, the kind of television that you could turn on and not be offended by blasphemy, scatological remarks, or promiscuous sexual scenes. People can watch all the shows from the golden 1950's and the early 1960's before a lot of television executives started to put their own corrupt lifestyles in their life's work in their writing and production on the screen.

So Ted Turner has this bonanza. He has CNN, with its "Crossfire" show that I am honored to host or guest on

occasionally, with its morning show, "Sonya Live," and with "Larry King Show," which, by the way, I am doing tonight live across the Nation, one of the No. 1 rated shows in cable television. So is CNN's "Crossfire" and CNN's "Headline News." In 20 minutes you learn everything that is happening around the world. Ted Turner's foreign overseas reporters are giving the networks a run for their money. As a matter of fact, I think some of the network reporters are better than the rest.

Now, let us look at this fourth network, CNN, in the news department. I have in a jocular way, but with some serious intent, referred to Dan Rather as "Gunga Dan." I have referred to "Peter Perfect" on ABC, and I mean the Canadian. He makes millions of dollars a year. I wish Peter Jennings would become an American citizen. Maybe he would feel in his gut different on a little issue like burning the flag. Also there is "Tom Terrific." And he is terrific. That is Tom Brokaw.

But then along comes Bernie Shaw. "Bernie, the Sledgehammer," was his nickname after the debate at UCLA between Vice President Bush, now our great President, and the Governor of Massachusetts, Michael Dukakis. Bernie Shaw is as objective and as good a reporter as I have ever seen.

I know the other three are all liberals, safely left of center, Hollywood cocktail party liberals. I told Bernie over at CNN, "Bernie, I don't know whether you are a liberal or a conservative."

He said, "Thank you. What a great compliment, Bob. You are never going to find out."

That is the kind of objectivity we should see in our press corps.

This success of Ted Turner is, I repeat, the Midas touch. Has this gone to my friend, Ted Turner's, head? Well, I am afraid the indications during the last month are that it has gone to his head.

When the cameras prowl this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, Americans who have not had the joy during the hot summer months like July or during the months around here that are incomparable in their beauty, in May and October, the edge of spring and fall, those who have not had the chance to come to this Federal capital, one of the most beautiful cities in the world, and sat in this Chamber, they have not noticed these 23 beautiful medallions in bas relief—or as Americans are wont to say, "bass relief"—that are around the walls of our Chamber depicting 23 of the world's greatest lawgivers.

We have the plaques of all the States hanging horizontally on the ceiling, all our 50 States and our territories, the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. We have only two pictures in

this room, the father of our county, George Washington, and the man from France who helped in our revolution, the great Marquis de Lafayette. But these 23 medallions are of the greatest lawgivers in history.

I hope that every freshman does what I did. Twelve or thirteen years ago I got a brochure from the House and I studied each one of these lawgivers. Up here is the great George Mason of Virginia. He would have been a President, but he was in his later years when Virginia signed both the Declaration of Independence and then later the Constitution.

Over here we have our beloved Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence.

This is Napoleon over here. Napoleonic law still reigns in most European states, and still in our great State of Louisiana.

You come around in this corner and find the great Rabbi Maimonides, who rewrote Jewish law and interpreted it in his scholarly post in Spain almost a century ago. We have all of these other great figures—Solon, the great Greek who lent his name as a synonym for lawgiver. We have Hammurabi again here, and this is Justinian, one of the great Roman Emperors.

On this wall by a great coincidence, there is a run of Christian saints. Here is St. Edward, the confessor, of England. This is St. Alphonse X of Spain, this is St. Gregory, one of the great Popes and lawgivers, and here is St. Louis, the great early French saint of the Capuchin house of French kings.

This is quite an array, but all of them are in profile. They are all in profile from Hammurabi to Jefferson except one, Moses. Mr. Speaker, Moses, as we will note again, is dead across from the Speaker's chair, right above the clock, just as "In God We Trust" is above you and the flag behind you. Moses is in full face and full beard and in all his majesty is looking down on us.

Why is he here? Is he here as a great Jewish prophet or a great leader? No, the reason his name rings throughout history, Mr. Speaker, is because of Mosaic law and those Ten Commandments to Moses upon which Western civilization is based, with a little foundation from the Babylonian, Hammurabi. But it is Mosaic law, refined for many of us by the New Testament and Christ's application of Mosaic law. And remember, the Son of God, Jesus Christ, said, "I do not come to overthrow the law. I come to perfect it."

Mosaic law is treasured by most literary and educated men. Even the people of Islam consider him a great prophet. The Buddhists, Confucius, everybody respects Moses.

But here is the purpose of bringing up these medallions, Mr. Speaker. Does Ted Turner respect Mosaic law? No. Ted Turner says—I am not making

this up, folks—at a meeting in Los Angeles of radio and television executives and cable industry financiers, speaking in his inimitable style, "Brace yourselves, folks. I'm going to blow everybody away. I am replacing the obsolete original Ten Commandments with my own set of 10 voluntary initiatives"—I am quoting his words here, folks—"and I am telling you executives to stand up, get off your knees, and go to work instead of spending all your time praying." He then used a lot of rotten speech and blasphemy and profanity, the papers said, weaving in and out language not fit for a family newspaper. They tried to quote him as best they could.

He then began with his commandments. "O.K.," Ted Turner said, "The first one is a love and respect for the planet Earth and living things thereon, especially my fellow species"—and they put in here the little grammatical "sic" meaning it is his meaning, not theirs—"mankind."

Well, that kind of sounds nice. I like that one. Is that not kind of some byplay on Jesus' great words, his great commandment when he said the greatest of all: "Love one another as you love yourselves."

But how does this first commandment stand up against "I am the Lord, thy God. Thou shalt have no other false Gods before me"?

I think I will go with Moses over Ted. I hope he is not offended.

"Two, I promise to treat all persons everywhere with dignity, respect, and friendliness." And then he has little asides between his commandments. I guess these will not be part of them when he has them chiseled in Georgia marble. And there is good marble down there. Some of it is in this building.

Then he said in his aside:

That worked with the Soviets for me. That's really all you have to think about; if you treat somebody with respect, dignity, and friendliness, you won't have an enemy in the world.

I guess he is recommending that to the political prisoners still held in Prim 35, one of the Soviet Gulag camps. The American Psychiatric Association just came back from Russia, and much to the chagrin of the Gorbachev team, they said, "You are still holding political prisoners in insane asylums, in mental institutions."

But Ted, of course, got the limousine tour over there for the Goodwill Games. That is when he turned before our eyes from a conservative caterpillar into a flaming liberal butterfly, and on everything he has metamorphosized before our eyes.

□ 1910

Ted Turner No. 3; by the way, Mosaic Law, which was given to him by God, most of us believe, I think it was, "Thou shalt not take the name of

the Lord, thy God, in vain," and in making his points in his commandments I am afraid dear Ted, my buddy, broke the second commandment.

No. 3: This is controversial for a man that has five children, he says. That is an aside, opening aside, but I had them 20 years ago before I realized that they were the population program. This last month I would not like to have been Ted Turner's third, fourth, or fifth son and daughters because he is saying to them, "I'm sorry I had you. I don't want you. I polluted the world. If only I had been as mature then 20 years ago as I am now."

He said, "Here's the commandment. I promise to have no more than two children or no more than my nation suggests." That is to cover China where they use infanticide and enforced, coerced abortion, so Ted is signing off on China. I wonder if he watched any of his own great channel coverage with Bernie Shaw over in Beijing looking out on the slaughter of Tiananmen Square, which is just a part of the dehumanization process that comes with the cheapening of human life with abortion.

I think I will take the Mosaic Commandment from God as, "Thou shalt honor the sabbath," but then did he not in his prologue say to, "get off your knees and stop praying"?

Ted was really impressed with his tour in Moscow. Let me tell my colleagues who are in Moscow now. I do not want to break Ted Turner's heart.

Remember when he won the America's Cup, kept it for our country, the news media called him Captain Courageous because he did not wear a polo shirt and a beautiful yachting cap, even a Greek one? He wore an engineer bill cap. Well, they called him Captain Courageous. Then he was Captain Cable. Then, when it looked like he was going to lose all his money, and the cable people rushed to be his angels and bail him out, he became Captain Comeback. Now he is starting a comic book called Captain Planet about the Earth. That is OK. We have already got Range Rover, and Ranger Raccoon, and Smokey the Bear, but, if he wants to be Captain Planet, that is his business. But the new one he wants to be is Captain Condom.

I do not think that is a good one, Ted, so I will take, "Honor the sabbath," No. 3.

Here comes No. 4, Mosaic Law from God. I should have Charleton Heston do this. I am going to write to Charleton about all this. Chuck, I hope you are listening. This is good stuff; is it not? I mean there you were with your white beard looking like Moses on this plaque on the House, coming down the first time you see all the people running naked, worshipping the golden calf, and, boom, you throw the tablets

down, God calls you back up to the mountain as you are playing Moses, and he has to give you the commandments all over again, and the fiery finger engraves the commandments in stone for the second time.

What was No. 4? I love it. My parents are gone, but I am getting a lot of it from my kids and my grandkids. It simply says, "Honor thy mother and father."

But what does Ted Turner give us? Every prophet of the 20th century, in the last years of the 20th century, four: "I promise to use my best efforts to save what is left of our natural world in its untouched state and to restore damaged and destroyed area where practical." It is good. It should be on the gate to Yosemite, and to King's Canyon National Park and to Yellowstone, every national park in the world. We should put it by the rain forests in Brazil, and they are being destroyed for selfish, short economic gain. It is a good one, Ted, but it is not as good as, "Honor thy mother and thy father."

No. 5: "Thou shalt not kill."

Everybody knows one can defend himself, but, if somebody dies, that is not murder. Everybody thinks that that one really should read, "Thou shalt not murder," and that is probably the way God gave it to Moses.

So, what does Ted want to replace this obsolete commandment, "Thou shalt not murder," which is why I am a prolifer? He replaces it with, "I pledge to use as little nonrenewable resources as possible."

This is why he has got a fix against styrofoam cups; I do not like them either; they are not degradable, but one is not allowed to have styrofoam cups over at CNN. That is a Ted Turner ruling. And a lot of people chuckle and smuggle in styrofoam cups.

I respect him on this. I use his hot water and the little soapy thing to get my coffee cups at CNN.

So, Ted, that is a good one, but it cannot replace, "Thou shalt not murder."

Six: Oh, I wonder if Turner has got a thing against this one. At the other meeting the other day he said, "I'm proabortion because nobody is going to tell me what my daughter should have, or my wife or my girl friend." People still cannot understand mixing the girl friend with the wife, and since he has come out so hard on proabortion, he is taking his WTBS station to put on a biased, outrageous propaganda film made by the proabortionists called Abortion for survival.

Then I did the hour discussion show afterward. He dragged out a retired old liberal host, Martin Agronsky, who tried to do a good job, but Martin has never hid his liberalism, and I had Nelly Gray with me, the founder of the great march for life, and across

from me was Faye Wattleton. I did find out down there that the very articulate Faye's mother is also articulate. She is a Baptist minister in Atlanta, and she is prolife. So much, checkmate, on Wattleton. And the other one was Ellie Smeal, who backed up Ted Turner, who said "Sex is fun."

All these proliferers don't want to have sex. Gee. Don't tell my wife, Sally, that. I have had her fooled all these years that I thought sex was all right after the childbearing years were over or even during it.

But he says, "People want to have fun with sex," and Ellie, who is, I understand, happily married to one man, she said, "Men and women like to have sex."

Well, we are not talking about you and your husband now, Ellie. We are talking about kind of a jerk that was on Geraldo last night, Gene Simmons of Kiss, who is sitting on the Geraldo Rivera saying he has had sex with 3,000 women of all ages.

I wonder if any minors snuck in there, and he broke the law, and he is taking nude pictures of all of them at the same time, and his partner has done the same, and another guy is talking about smoking marijuana on the roof of the White House when Jimmy Carter invited him in. One of the country singers and Geraldo is giggling about all of this, and he says he has not written a book on his womanizing years either. Boy, the quality of television has really gone down. Ted, I thought you founded all your stations to correct this idiocy of secularism run rampant, what we saw at the three networks.

Back to the commandments.

Six: "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Thank you, Moses, for bringing us God's word.

What is Ted's No. 6? Six: "I pledge to use as little toxic chemicals, pesticides and other poisons as possible, and to work for the reduction by others." This is a great statement for the Environmental Protection Agency, and that is the rules they try to follow, but hardly the equivalent of a Mosaic Law.

Seven: "Thou shalt not steal." Pretty simple. Now, we break that down into petty thievery, grand theft, auto, robbery, armed robbery, burglary, pickpocketing, bunko, white collar crime. There are lots of ways to rob banks and human beings, but that little commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," is the beginning of all the codification of laws under Judeo-Christian ethics, English common law and Napoleonic law, and Napoleon up here had his approaches to that commandment, "Thou shalt not steal."

What does Ted—we are calling them the Ted Commandments—what is his seven under the Ted Commandments? Seven: "I promise to contribute to those less fortunate than myself, to

help them become self-sufficient, and enjoy the benefits of a decent life, including clean air and water, adequate food and health care, housing, education and individual rights." It is kind of a mixed bag there; very positive, Theodore, good, excellent, fine rules to live by, kind of all comes out in Jesus with his golden commandment, "Love others as you would love yourself," but not really the equivalent of the Mosaic Law that is running down to us from three and a half millennia, "Thou shalt not steal."

Eight, and by the way from my Protestant brothers I know that, when we get up around here, we Protestants and Catholics, all of us Christian brothers and sisters, we kind of get off on our numbering a little bit, but this is what the nuns taught me, so bear with me. I do not have it written down. I am going from memory, so forgive me; I think I have it right. No. 8: a good one for courts and the world, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Not bad, Ted. Pretty good, Moses. Thank you for bringing it to us from God.

Here is Ted's: "I reject the use of force, in particular military force, and back United Nations arbitration of international disputes." The United Nations is on a roll now. It is doing a pretty good job in the southern part of Africa. They did zip in the horrible between Iraq and Iran, the brotherly states next to one another, millions killed by poison gas, suicide. The United Nations did not know what to do there. I guess the citizens of Grenada would still have to be under communism when Hudson Austin murdered the other Communists of a less virulent variety, the New Jewel movement, when he killed him off. I guess they would have to be under hard-core communism, like Nicaragua and Castro. I guess we could not have invaded Nazi Germany, all those guys that hit the beach. Cannot he run "The Longest Day" occasionally? He ran Cornelius Ryan's other book into a movie, "A Bridge Too Far." I wish somebody had the money to make "The Last Battle," the story of the Siege of Berlin by Russians. I mean his Russian friends over there, they told you all about the great patriotic war, which is what they call World War II.

Ted, every cop in this city has to take up a gun to save the lives of those two 15-year old girls who were gunned down the night before last. Sometimes a police officer, or an international police officer, which is what we were doing on the beaches of Normandy; you tell those surviving Army Rangers that climbed up Point du Hoc, or the 101st and 82d Airborne guys that go over to Europe every few years for a reunion over there. You tell the 10,000 graves, the parents of the men who

were on the Normandy bluffs that I just flew over with a delegation of Democrats; you tell them that they did not have the right to take up arms militarily.

Back the United Nations. I back the United Nations. I am a conservative who does not want us out of the United States and us out of the United Nations, but it is a very weak organization sometimes, and I hope they will get stronger, but it does not replace, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against your neighbors."

□ 1720

Nine and ten. I wonder if Ted has trouble with these.

Nine. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife." I do not think Ted has ever coveted anybody else's wife. He has just gone through a recent divorce after 25 years that I think broke his kids' heart.

He has been my hero. He has five kids. I have five kids.

He loves sports, loves sailing, loves baseball, loves hockey, loves football; five kids.

He sat in the Cannon Caucus and told us how liberal and how the networks have gone wild with violence and sex and he was going to change it.

I brought him down to a luncheon down in H-139. He dazzled the Members. Liberals walked out in anger. We conservatives thought we had found a media hero. Now he comes out with his own commandments.

So what has he got to replace "thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife?"

Nine—and he actually says the No. 9. "Nine, I support the total elimination of all nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons of mass destruction."

Great, Ted. That is what the START talks are all about in Geneva. That is what the INS Treaty is about. That is what the Conventional Arms Talks are about.

Forty nations around this world have chemical weapons, biological weapons.

Guess how many admit to having them? Two, the Russians and the Americans. Everybody else denies it and nine of the countries who have them sit on the Chemical Disarmament Conference in Geneva and lie through their teeth.

It is a tough, difficult world, Ted.

Ten. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods." Ted does not covet anybody's goods. He is a typical free enterprise entrepreneur in his glory years.

I just told you about all the successes he has. He has the Midas touch. Anything he touches turns into gold. He went through his dark years when the cable people rushed to bail him out of near bankruptcy. He has not coveted anybody. He has not had time for greed. He has led too active a life.

I do not know what he has against Moses' Ten Commandments, God's Ten Commandments, but here is his tenth one.

"I support the United Nations and its efforts to collectively improve the conditions of the planet."

So do I, Ted, but I will put my money on the U.S. of A., the United States of America will be around if the U.N. fails. I hope they both succeed, but we got 213 years under our belt, Ted. They have got since 1945 in San Francisco. The issue is in doubt on them and the only thing that is going to make the issue in doubt in our civilization is people standing up saying that the Ten Commandments of Mosaic law given to that great Jewish prophet by God are obsolete, are going to blow people away and come up with your interesting, but hardly historical Ten Commandments.

Mr. Speaker, my bottom line here is when people watch this debate on WTBS tonight that I participate, and keep in mind that is not really a fair debate when you open up with a half-hour hard propaganda film that does not show one baby, one aborted baby, will not show a live baby, does not show the process of birth, does not tell you that a child's heart starts to beat at 10 weeks, just shows you a little petry dish of some bloody ground up embryonic matter, very little of it at that, and says, "That is all an abortion is, just this little bit of red stuff that looks like some jelly."

And as Susan Smith, one of the great 26-year-old spokespeople for the National Right to Life said, it is like looking at applesauce and saying, "That is not an apple."

Well, anybody ground up through the meat grinders that some of the butchers use in their abortions, you are not going to look much like a human being, an embryo or a fetus, or a baby when they get through with you, particularly the suction abortions in the fourth and fifth months of pregnancy, the saline injection babies where you burn them alive inside the womb and then the woman goes into early labor, and some of those saline babies come out. As a matter of fact, there is a 14-year-old that I saw talking the other day that was a saline injection attempted abortion. He survived and he is now 14 years old.

So Ted puts on his biased show. I participated because I said, "I won't go down unless you give me a thousand bucks, and I am going to give it to Mother Teresa." It was sponsored by the Better World Society. That is another brainstorming operation of Ted Turner. Good people work there, but unfortunately, instead of just trying to do things about global warming and the depletion of the ozone layer and the destruction of the rain forests around the world, things that we all believe in and share with anybody who

is part of the human race on this planet.

They are also into heavy population control, and that is what this show has been about half the time, is world population control.

I did not get the word Robespierre. I got it out, but you have to listen hard to hear it because Faye Wattleton and Ellie Smeal started screaming.

But I said, you know, there have been other people in history that have been big on population control. Pol Pot wanted to thin out the population in Cambodia. He killed 2 out of 8 million people.

Adolf Hitler—and then Ellie Smeal says he was against abortion. Only for Germans, pure Aryans of the super race, but he not only agreed with abortions for Gypsies and Jews and Slavs and Russians, he proceeded to try to kill all of them at every age.

Then I love it when these people say that Hitler was a Catholic. He may have been born and baptized a Catholic in Austria when he was a little baby, but the whole Hitler gang were avowed practicing atheists. Some of them were debauched, like Goering and the whole Hitler mob was demonic at the end and they were engaging in unrestrained population control.

I mentioned Stalin. He used population control on the Gulag farmers who would not be collectivized in the Ukraine, killed between 7 and 10 million of them, starved them to death.

Then I mentioned Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot.

Then there is Idi Amin, killed three or four hundred thousand just in the time I have been in Congress.

Then I mentioned Robespierre. By then they were screaming. Robespierre, on the floor of the National Assembly which grew out of the Estates General that Louis the XIV brought back after centuries of nonuse, that grew into the People's National Assembly that still exists after several transmog transformations there in France. It is sitting there right now on the floor of the National Assembly, the father of modern day terrorism, Robespierre, said, "We can't share the wealth in this country with 25 million Frenchmen." They are only now at about 51 million.

He said, "We have to thin the population."

One of the founders of the reign of terror, Danton said, "How about half of that, 12½?"

Another one said, "How about 5 million?"

Not to be undone, Robespierre says, "Four million is about the right population for France," vintage 1793-94.

What were they going to do with the other 21 million people? It was Robespierre who gave us the very clever expression used for 200 years, "You can't make an omelet unless you break

eggs." That is vintage Robespierre, folks. Kill 21 million people and then you will have 4 million Frenchmen rummaging around in that country from Provence to the wine country of Champagne areas, all the way over the English Channel, the beautiful Normandy area down to Beritz and Bordeaux wine country. What a country for only 4 million people. That is thinning out the herd. That is population control.

Now I am running out of time here. I said I would only take 30 minutes, and the great staff here wants to go home. Just let me touch on a few other things.

Ethiopia, they show starving people in Ethiopia in Ethiopia. Faye and I were arguing, a little ego thing, who had traveled more. I have been in 130 countries and I said, "I have been to Ethiopia." I knew she had.

The problem in Ethiopia is a sleezy Communist government out of Addis Ababa who is thinning out the population through a program of starvation. It is not a shortage of American dollars to kill those black babies in their mother's wombs. Well, at least the mother is prolife. She will come around eventually.

And then, oh, 12 percent condom failure rate, on their show. I did not even get around on the so-called debate with all the yelling to get to that point.

Does Dr. Koop, who is my friend, just retired, put in a mixed bag, most of it good as Surgeon General, how can he tell the whole country that the answer to solving AIDS, although he does not see it quite this definitively, is condoms? Folks, a 12-percent failure rate means, and I told this to Ellie Smeal and Faye Wattleton after the show, that means that every 100 people who are AIDS carriers who use condoms, they are going to kill 12 out of every 100 people that they have sex with, a 12-percent failure rate. When I brought it up after the show, you know, they said, "Well, we don't believe in that statistic. That was one of the wrong statistics in our film."

And here is the way the debate, which you can see tonight, they are going to rerun it Friday, they are going to rerun it Sunday in the evening. If you think I should not have gone down to participate to lend credibility to this, fine, but remember, my only defense is Mother Teresa gets \$1,000, and I did tell Agronsky and Ted Turner to watch it, how we could have had a fair show.

Run one of our prolife films, first or last. Flip a coin if you want to be fair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Our films are "The Slaughter of Innocence," "The Eclipse of Reason," or the excellent one that turned the abortion debate in this country around, "The Silent Scream." Run any one of those three. Then run "Abortion for Survival." Flip a coin. Vice versa. Then have the same panel, Ellie, Faye, Nellie Gray and myself, have Martin Agronsky, but put Bill Buckley next to him. Put Pat Buchanan.

Ted Turner loves his show, "Crossfire." It may have been his idea.

There are two hosts there, Braden and Buchanan. I sit in sometimes, and it is balanced. That is the way you balance that program and that is the way I look forward to Ted Turner, because we cannot take his sportsman title away from him.

□ 1930

He knows if he loves boxing what Marquis of Queensberry rules are. He knows the sports terms that we use here in our economic debates, that we all want a level playing field. He knows, as a man who owns the Braves, owns the Hawks, and one of these days he will probably buy the Atlanta Falcons because of that Midas touch; he knows what a fair playing field is in sports.

That is why I went down there, Ted, to make my opening plea to you through the television camera to give me a fair playing field. If you have got your pro-abortion viewpoints, fine. You have respected my viewpoints in our friendship in the past. For Lord's sake, you carried one of my little "Dornan for Congress" combs around in your pocket for 2 years. Give me a break, Ted. I like your commandments, except call them something else. Do not demean Moses and the commandments of God, and give us a fair playing field.

A final thought on the so-called debate tonight: They in their half-hour show, "Abortion for Survival," this propaganda, ridiculous piece, they ended with a letter from a woman who died of an illegal abortion in 1934, and it is read by her brother this year. She closes it out by saying, and I read this to Ellie and Faye at the end of the debate, and the woman says with her dying words, a letter that she wrote just before she died, "I think truly that only those should be allowed to live who have a fair shot at life."

When I hit the word "life" Ellie Smeal screamed, "Oh, Congressman, how could you? You are reading the words of a dead woman." Wait a minute, I learned about this dead woman in their documentary. It is their closing line, one of their doctors

that prattles on through it all the way through the film, and I think his name starts with an "E." He is the guy that was in a trial up in Boston for suffocating a baby. They use all male doctors who made money off of abortion all of their lives. I am sure some of them sincerely hold their beliefs and think that this is the way to make it a better America to survive, and that is the title, "Abortion for Survival."

No, the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, and I will close on this, Ted, we are still friends, I hope. You are an amazing American. You are on the cover of Business Week. You are called Captain Comback. I prefer that to Captain Condom.

Ted, call me. The number is (202)225-2965. I will sponsor you for a lunch again down at H-139 and, Ted, my sportsman friend who in glory held the America's Cup that was lost the next time around when you were not at the helm of the defending yacht, Ted, call me and let us discuss the Marquis of Queensberry rules on the abortion debate. It is the most passionate debate going on in America now. It is important. We agree on that. Let us be fair.

The banner line word in all journalism, print or electronic: fairness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARPER). The Chair cautions the gentleman from California from specifically addressing individual viewers during debate. The gentleman may only address the Chair.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I was wrong, and I will strike those last remarks from the written RECORD. I should not have done that. I got carried away.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MORELLA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on July 25, July 26, and July 27.

Mr. DELAY, for 60 minutes, today and on July 24.

Mr. GRANDY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, on August 1, August 2, August 3, and August 4.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DYSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SWIFT, for 60 minutes, on July 24.

Mr. BRUCE, for 60 minutes, on July 24.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 60 minutes, on July 25.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 30 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MORELLA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. DOUGLAS in two instances.

Mr. HEFLEY.

Mr. BUECHNER.

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. LOWERY of California.

Mr. HANSEN.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. KYL.

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. BARTON of Texas.

Mr. ROHRBACHER.

Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. GRANDY.

Mr. TAUKE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DYSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mrs. BYRON.

Mr. DYMALLY.

Mr. HERTEL.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.

Mr. LaFALCE.

Mr. APPELEGATE.

Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. DYMALLY.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. ALEXANDER.

Mr. BATES.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. DOWNEY.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Mr. WALGREN.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. DARDEN.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 21, 1989, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1479. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting the supplemental contract award report for the period July 1, 1989, to August 31, 1989, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2431(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1480. A letter from the Acting President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting notification that the final report recommendations of tied aid practices of other countries is nearing completion, pursuant to Public Law 100-418, section 3302(c); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1481. A letter from the Acting President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the annual report of the Bank's operations for fiscal year 1988, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 685g(a); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1482. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a statement with respect to a proposed transaction involving United States exports to the Republic of Colombia in excess of \$100 million, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1483. A letter from the Chief, Insurance and Employee Benefits, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the 1987 annual pension report for the USAF nonappropriated fund retirement plan for civil employees, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(8); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1484. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the status reports of frazil ice control on the Salmon River, Salmon, ID; the Kankakee River in the vicinity of Wilmington, IL, pursuant to Public Law 99-662, section 1101(e)(1) (100 Stat. 4224); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1485. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a copy of the project report of the Corps of Engineers for the Kanawha River, Charleston, WV, with his views thereon, pursuant to Public Law 99-662; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1486. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a copy of the project report of the Corps of Engineers for Poplar Brook, Bor-

ough of Deal, NJ, with his views thereon, pursuant to Public Law 99-662; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1487. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting on behalf of the President, the report on the situation in El Salvador which documents progress achieved by the Government of El Salvador in five areas, pursuant to Public Law 100-461, section 556(b); jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

1488. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Labor, transmitting notification that the Acting Secretary of State has determined that it would be in the national interest of the United States for the Export-Import Bank to provide financial guarantees and insurance for a purchase of defense articles and services by the Government of Colombia, for antinarcotics purposes; with copies of the Determination and Memorandum of Justification, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(6)(B); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Foreign Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2904. A bill to authorize construction and equipment of a fireproof building for the House Publications Facility, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 101-167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H.R. 2940. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to convey vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet to groups of nonprofit organizations for use in funding merchant mariner memorials; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COURTER:

H.R. 2941. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to clarify the extent of rights against nongovernmental discrimination under certain civil rights laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 2942. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the personal exemption to \$3,000 for dependents who have not attained age 6; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan:

H.R. 2943. A bill to improve the administration and management of the Department of Defense school system for dependents in overseas areas; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 2944. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the America

in Space National Historical Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida):

H.R. 2945. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing oil and gas leases on certain portions of the Outer Continental Shelf off the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. ROE, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 2946. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to the use of inventions in outer space; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LaFALCE (for himself and Mrs. BOGGS):

H.R. 2947. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to assist the development of small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LEVINE of California:

H.R. 2948. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to require disclosure of information regarding the use of tuna fishing methods which directly result in the death of marine mammals; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McNULTY (for himself and Mr. VENTO):

H.R. 2949. A bill to authorize a study of nationally significant places in American Labor History; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. TRAXLER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. CARR, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. BRUCE):

H.R. 2950. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 2951. A bill to amend section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to reserve housing certificates and vouchers for homeless families and displaced families affected by domestic violence; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2952. A bill to amend the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 to carry out research, and develop judicial training curricula, relating to child custody litigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 2953. A bill to establish a comprehensive marine pollution restoration program, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEILSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CROCKETT,

Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. De LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLFE, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 2954. A bill to provide for a grant program to assist eligible consortia in providing services to individuals with acquired immunodeficiency syndrome or symptomatic infection with the human immunodeficiency virus; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself and Mr. McDADE):

H.R. 2955. A bill entitled "Business Review Act of 1989"; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

H.R. 2956. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the development and operation of centers to conduct research with respect to birth control and centers to conduct research with respect to infertility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2957. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Academy of Space, Science, and Technology; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. UNSOELD:

H.R. 2958. A bill to require that the Secretary of State seek to secure an international agreement to ban the use of driftnet fishing on the high seas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WISE:

H.R. 2959. A bill to establish a deficit reduction trust fund and a build America trust fund in the Treasury of the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means; Public Works and Transportation; Science, Space, and Technology; and Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2960. A bill to establish a joint Federal-State Commission on Policies and Programs Affecting Alaska Natives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.J. Res. 371. Joint resolution designating September 24 through 30, 1989, as "National African-American Historical and Cultural Museums Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H. Con. Res. 172. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that, for purposes of determining child custody, evidence of spousal abuse should create a statutory presumption that it is detrimental to the child to be placed in the custody of an abusive parent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

H. Con. Res. 173. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to birth control and infertility; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. Res. 208. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for further expenses of investigations and studies of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the first session of the One Hundred First Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H. Res. 209. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the Office of the Historian of the House of Representatives to the Clerk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PICKETT (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H. Res. 210. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of the Interior conduct a study to determine whether or not there should be an administrative appeal process to review decisions regarding the denying or revoking of access permits to units of the National Wildlife Refuge System; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Colorado:

H.R. 2961. A bill for the relief of Sonanong Poonpipat (Latch); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LaFALCE:

H.R. 2962. A bill for the relief of Noco Energy Corp.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADIGAN:

H.R. 2963. A bill for the relief of Steven T. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 30: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 40: Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 44: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 110: Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 215: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 239: Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 425: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. CONTE.

H.R. 461: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 486: Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 488: Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 514: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 614: Mr. MINETA and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 746: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 939: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 979: Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 982: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1074: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1109: Mr. CRAIG and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 1136: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr.

BATEMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 1180: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1243: Mr. PEASE.

H.R. 1246: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 1432: Mr. FROST, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 1453: Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1470: Mrs. BOGGS.

H.R. 1574: Mr. BELENSON.

H.R. 1586: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1602: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1674: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. FROST, Mr. WISE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 2097: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 2131: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2222: Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 2237: Mr. KOLTZ and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2273: Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. REGULA, Ms. LONG, Mr. EARLY, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 2360: Mr. WELDON and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2381: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 2403: Mr. HERTEL, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 2406: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2414: Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. FALEOMAVEAGA, Mr. TALLON, Mr. SHARP, and Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

H.R. 2415: Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 2504: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 2528: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 2530: Mr. HEFNER and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 2585: Mr. YATES, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2609: Mr. MADIGAN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. ECKART, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. CONTE.

H.R. 2641: Mr. GRANDY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 2648: Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 2671: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2676: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 2681: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2712: Mr. McEWEN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SWIFT, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. SABO, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DERRICK, and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 2726: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PENNY, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 2756: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FROST, Mr. YATES, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2770: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. WALKER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 2801: Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 2804: Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 2812: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. BARNARD.

H.J. Res. 130: Mr. COURTER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. MAVROULES.

H.J. Res. 138: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GALLO, Mr. FROST, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.J. Res. 164: Mr. BATES, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LENT, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. KASTENMEIER.

H.J. Res. 188: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.J. Res. 199: Mr. BLILEY.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.J. Res. 220: Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.J. Res. 230: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. PASHAYAN.

H.J. Res. 241: Mr. COX, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TALLON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.J. Res. 248: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. LELAND.

H.J. Res. 255: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. FLIPPO, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.J. Res. 265: Mr. DENNY SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. PARKER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ROUKEMA, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SHAW, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. SYNAR.

H.J. Res. 271: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. JONES of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 278: Mr. PASHAYAN and Mr. PARKER.

H.J. Res. 286: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.J. Res. 291: Mr. TRAXLER and Mr. McNULTY.

H.J. Res. 318: Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. ARMEY.

H.J. Res. 328: Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. PARKER.

H.J. Res. 355: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.J. Res. 364: Mr. RHODES.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. RUSSO, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr.

FLAKE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. WOLPE.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HENRY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H. Con. Res. 92: Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H. Con. Res. 101: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WISE, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 156: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. JAMES, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. PAXON.

H. Con. Res. 166: Mr. PENNY and Mr. WEISS.

H. Res. 116: Mr. VENTO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H. Res. 130: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. PRICE.

H. Res. 134: Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. PARKER.

H. Res. 191: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. WALKER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, and Mr. WELDON.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2461

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

—At the end of title IX (page 212, after line 21), add the following new section:

SEC. 903. BUY-AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.

(a) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY OF STATE.—(1) If the Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of Commerce, determines that the public interest so requires, the Secretary of Defense may award to a domestic firm a contract that, under the use of competitive procedures, would be awarded to a foreign firm, if—

(A) the final product of the domestic firm will be completely assembled in the United States;

(B) when completely assembled, not less than 50 percent of the final product of the domestic firm will be domestically produced; and

(C) the difference between the bids submitted by the foreign and domestic firms is not more than 6 percent.

(2) In determining under this subsection whether the public interest so requires, the Secretary of State shall take into account United States international obligations and trade relations.

(b) LIMITED APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply to the extent to which—

(1) such applicability would not be in the public interest;

(2) compelling national security considerations require otherwise; or

(3) the United States Trade Representative determines that such an award would be in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or an international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) LIMITATION.—This section shall apply only to contracts for which—

(1) amounts are authorized by this Act to be made available; and

(2) solicitations for bids are issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on contracts covered under this section and entered into with foreign entities in fiscal years 1990 and 1991, including—

(1) the number of contracts that meet the requirements of subsection (a) but that are determined by the United States Trade Representative to be in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or an inter-

national agreement to which the United States is a party; and

(2) the number of contracts for which amounts are authorized by this Act and which are awarded pursuant to this section.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "domestic firm" means a business entity that is incorporated in the United States and that conducts business operations in the United States; and

(2) the term "foreign firm" means a business entity not described in paragraph (1).

—At the end of title XII (page 253, after line 15) insert the following new section:

# SEC. 1243. REDUCTION IN OVERALL AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.

Notwithstanding the specific authorizations of appropriations in this Act, the aggregate amount that is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1990 pursuant to those authorizations is the amount equal to the sum of the authorizations of appropriations provided in this Act for fiscal year 1990 reduced by 3 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has passed the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1990. This bill, H.R. 1633, provides for the authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990. The bill covers a wide range of defense activities, including personnel, procurement, research and development, and operations and maintenance. It also includes provisions for the reduction of the overall authorization level for fiscal year 1990 by 3 percent, as required by the Gramm-Rudman-Holman Act. The bill was passed by a vote of 387 yeas to 18 nays. I am confident that the Senate will also pass this bill, and that it will become law.

**AMENDMENTS**  
Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following amendments were submitted as follows:

**BY MR. TROTT:**  
At the end of title XII, page 253, after line 15, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 1243. REDUCTION IN OVERALL AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.**  
Notwithstanding the specific authorizations of appropriations in this Act, the aggregate amount that is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1990 pursuant to those authorizations is the amount equal to the sum of the authorizations of appropriations provided in this Act for fiscal year 1990 reduced by 3 percent.

**BY MR. TROTT:**  
At the end of title XII, page 253, after line 15, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 1243. REDUCTION IN OVERALL AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.**  
Notwithstanding the specific authorizations of appropriations in this Act, the aggregate amount that is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1990 pursuant to those authorizations is the amount equal to the sum of the authorizations of appropriations provided in this Act for fiscal year 1990 reduced by 3 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has passed the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1990. This bill, H.R. 1633, provides for the authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990. The bill covers a wide range of defense activities, including personnel, procurement, research and development, and operations and maintenance. It also includes provisions for the reduction of the overall authorization level for fiscal year 1990 by 3 percent, as required by the Gramm-Rudman-Holman Act. The bill was passed by a vote of 387 yeas to 18 nays. I am confident that the Senate will also pass this bill, and that it will become law.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has passed the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1990. This bill, H.R. 1633, provides for the authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990. The bill covers a wide range of defense activities, including personnel, procurement, research and development, and operations and maintenance. It also includes provisions for the reduction of the overall authorization level for fiscal year 1990 by 3 percent, as required by the Gramm-Rudman-Holman Act. The bill was passed by a vote of 387 yeas to 18 nays. I am confident that the Senate will also pass this bill, and that it will become law.